THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Very Rev. S. C. Carpenter, D.D., The Deanery, Exeter, to whom MSS. should be sent. Reviews and all business communications should be addressed to S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

Vol. XXXIII SEPTEMBER, 1936 No. 195

EDITORIAL

Reports of Commissions are apt to "have their day and cease to be." We hope that this will not be the fate of the Report on Church and State. No doubt it has still to be discussed at many diocesan and other conferences, but it deserves much more careful attention than is implied in listening to a few speeches about it. It ought to be read and considered deeply. Fortunately it happens that there is a first-class commentary on it by Dr. H. M. Relton, *Church and State* (Philip Allan, 2s. 6d.), to which Prebendary Hanson, Dean of King's College, London, who really ought to write more, has contributed a brilliant Introduction. Dr. Relton's book is much more than a commentary on the Report, inasmuch as his criticism is constructive, and he adds a great deal of his own to the general discussion of the subject. It is always profitable to see how an ecclesiastical topic is viewed by a real theologian, and it is accordingly refreshing to read in the chapter on the Nature and Function of the Church that "the whole line of argument suggested, for example, by Hamilton in his work on *The People of God* is a necessary presupposition of any attempt to understand the Church as in any real sense the divinely ordained continuation of the Israel of God." Discussions of the Church are futile unless there is understanding of the necessary theological presuppositions. Richard Hooker was both following true ancient precedent and setting subsequent English theologians on right lines when he related his churchmanship to his Christology. Dr. Relton's treatment of the relation of Church and State is built on a strong foundation of theological learning.

He is not wholeheartedly in favour of the Report. He seems dubious about the novel proposal that "spiritual"

measures, duly certified as such by competent and trusted representatives of Church and State, should go direct to the Crown. His own proposal is indicated in the terms of a resolution brought forward by him in the Lower House of Convocation of Canterbury in 1934, and carried by a very large majority:

> "That whereas in the present divided State of Christendom the lack of some effective authority to which appeal can be made for such Acts as would be recognized as binding on the conscience constitutes a great weakness in the Church of England;
>
> "This House is of opinion that such an effective principle of authority is inherent in the Sacred Synod of the Province, and ought to be exercised by the Corporate Episcopate acting constitutionally—*i.e.*, through the Convocations—the Acts of which, when passed by the Upper House and concurred in by the Lower House (though lacking the full force of formal Canons), should be binding in conscience on all bishops and clergy of the province."

Anciently the laity as well as the clergy were bound by synodical legislation, but it is manifest that the Houses of Laity both ought and would desire to have an opportunity of associating themselves with verdicts which are to be binding on the conscience of the Church. Dr. Relton accordingly agrees that the Houses of Laity in the Church Assembly or Diocesan Conferences or both may well be used in securing lay co-operation.

Such a method has the great advantage of being constitutional. In fact, the Convocations have enjoyed for centuries the right of access to the Crown, and have ample authority to act in the rather less formal way which is here proposed. It is recognized by the friends of the 1927 Prayer Book to be an unfortunate thing that the Book, owing to circumstances, never came back to the Convocations for the final approval which they would certainly have given. Accordingly, it is possible to charge it with lacking canonical authority. It is only fair to the makers of the Report to say that they also recognize the authority of Convocation. But Dr. Relton queries the proposal about deviations from the Book of Common Prayer. His words are important:

> "We should prefer a less ambiguous phraseology which would make it quite clear that what is meant is that no deviations should be sanctioned by any Bishop except those which are in conformity to principles determined

by the corporate episcopate acting constitutionally—*i.e.*, through the Convocations and with the concurrence of the Laity in the Church Assembly. The only constitutional spiritual authority for the Church is the Convocation, not the Church Assembly. The concurrence of the House of Laity or the Church Assembly is, we admit, needed, and in these days necessary, but the discussion and determination of doctrinal matters is outside the province of the Church Assembly as such."

Like other sensible people, Dr. Relton recognizes that the two great needs are unity, by which it need hardly be said that he does not mean uniformity, and the vigorous prosecution of pastoral and evangelistic work. His analysis of the present situation is ultimately optimistic:

> "If to outside observers the Church of England seems to present itself as one long wrangle of contending parties, its internecine stress and trial is precisely what ought to be expected of a Church performing so useful a function and trying so hazardous an experiment for the benefit of the whole of disunited Christendom. Our agony is the hope of the future."

In the same way it is encouraging to hear Mr. Hanson say that "the tension between the spiritual and the temporal forces in human life and society . . . is not a mark of the immaturity of our civilization, but of its advanced maturity. . . . In a deep and abiding sense this tension and recurrent conflict between the temporal and the spiritual *is* Western civilization. It is Christianity *in via*."

It is known that the Church Union proposes to hold an International Convention in 1940. To this end a number of essays have been prepared in advance. The first batch of five has just reached us. They constitute Section II. of the complete list, and they are concerned with the causes of disruption. They have a wise little Foreword by the Bishop of Brechin. Four of the five are by lay writers—Mr. A. W. James, Professor Hamilton Thompson, Miss Beatrice Hamilton Thompson, and Bro. George Every, S.S.M. They write on The Growth of the Papacy, The Division between East and West, The Roots of the Sixteenth-Century Reformation: (*a*) Ecclesiastical and Doctrinal, and (*b*) Sociological and Political. The last, by the Rev. T. M. Parker, is on Post-Reformation Developments. They are all good, some of them first-rate, and the one which interested us most was that written by Brother George.

BISHOP BUTLER AND THE PRIMACY

Did he decline the See of Canterbury in 1747?

One of the most edifying legends of the Church of England in the eighteenth century, which has been of inestimable service to point the moral and adorn the tale of its melancholy history, is that of the refusal by Joseph Butler, Bishop of Bristol, of the dignity of Primate of All England upon the ground of his despair of the future of a falling church. Equally remarkable with the refusal and its reason is the apparently slight impression which the incident made upon the mind and memory of contemporaries, for it finds no mention in the reciprocal correspondence to and from the Duke of Newcastle in relation to the vacancy of the See of Canterbury in 1747. It may not therefore be a wholly unprofitable exercise to survey the positive and negative evidence available in order to assess the historical probability of the alleged episode.

The only source of evidence in support of the tradition is contained in a volume of *Memoirs of the Life, Character, and Writings of Joseph Butler*, published by Thomas Bartlett in 1839, whose account is as follows:

> "It has already been hinted that, as the more frequent intercourse of Bishop Butler with the King [as Clerk of the Closet] enabled the sovereign to form a just estimate of his worth, his esteem for his person and respect for his character were proportionately raised. It is not therefore surprising that, when an opportunity arose, his majesty should afford the strongest proof of the estimation in which he held him by desiring to elevate him to the primacy; justly conceiving that his mild and courteous demeanour, united with his splendid talents, would adorn and dignify the highest seat upon the episcopal bench. Upon the decease of Archbishop Potter, therefore, in 1747, it was proposed that Butler should resign the see of Bristol that he might become the metropolitan of all England. The reply which he is reported to have made to an offer so flattering to human ambition, was strongly indicative of the unfavourable view which he took of the prospects which were opening before the friends of the national establishment from the alarming temper of the times. He is said to have answered: 'It was too late for him to try to support a falling church'" (pp. 95-6).

To this relation a footnote is appended to the effect that the anecdote "is given upon the authority of the late Lady Saxton, who was connected with the family and preserved many of his sayings. Mrs. Sarah Butler also has heard her father, the Rev. Joseph Butler, relate the same anecdote." A further amplification of the story is given by the record of a visit paid to Butler at London by a wealthy and eccentric nephew in order to offer the bishop an advance of £20,000 or any greater sum he might require, if, as was supposed, his refusal had been due to financial poverty. Unfortunately Mr. Bartlett gives no authority whatsoever for this embellishment, which can hardly be held, therefore, to contribute to the credibility of the tradition. The story rests in consequence upon the biographer's record of an oral family tradition, of which the essential facts are that Butler was offered the see of Canterbury in 1747 and declined.

On the other side, thanks to the abundant correspondence of the Duke of Newcastle preserved in the Additional Manuscripts of the British Museum (the Newcastle and Hardwicke Papers) and in the State Papers Domestic in the Public Record Office, there has survived a considerable volume of evidence concerning the steps taken to fill the primacy on the death of Potter. Archbishop Potter died suddenly on October 10, 1747; and the primacy was offered with such despatch to Edmund Gibson, Bishop of London (who had indeed been canvassed as the probable successor for some years), that his formal letter of refusal was written only two days after Potter's unexpected death, on October 12. The Bishop of London declined on the score of "old age and growing infirmities," both of which were proper grounds, since he was within two months of his seventy-eighth birthday (Add. MSS. 32713, f. 243). The Duke of Newcastle, writing on the following day to the Duke of Cumberland, reported the offer of the primacy to Gibson and his refusal; and added that "it is now offered to the Bishop of Salisbury, who, I hope and believe, will accept it" (*ibid.*, f. 249). The actual offer to Bishop Sherlock was made in a letter from the duke of October 12, with the expression of a strong hope that it would be accepted and with an express assurance, necessary in view of recent relations between Fulham and Lambeth, that Gibson had counselled this step and would afford every assistance in his power to the new archbishop (S.P. 36, vol. 102, f. 15). Sherlock, however, replied in turn on the following day, October 13, with a formal refusal, likewise on the ground of old age and ill health, being in his seventieth year, which he accompanied by a private letter emphasizing the reality of his physical afflictions (*ibid.*, ff. 17 and 18). So firm was Sherlock's

resolution that he remained at Sarum throughout the exchange of letters between himself and the duke, and did not make any proposal of coming up to London to discuss the matter. Despite the firmness of the refusal, Newcastle, after an interview with George II., wrote again to his episcopal friend on October 15 to declare the king's desire that he should reconsider the offer and expressing a determination not to approach any other bishop until his further resolution were made known. "If your lordship persists in your refusal," he added, "the natural thing must be, and it seems to be the king's intention, that the Archbishop of York should go to Canterbury. And in that case we think the rightest thing will be to send Bishop Hutton to York. These will be good and, I hope, reputable promotions" (*ibid.*, f. 19). On October 18 Sherlock wrote privately to the duke reiterating his refusal, and followed this on October 21 by two further letters to the same effect, one for the minister's private perusal and the other for submission to the king (*ibid.*, ff. 25, 32, and 33).

It is worthy of note that within a week of the death of Potter the primacy had been offered once to the Bishop of London and twice to his brother of Sarum, so that "the ecclesiastical minister" had lost no time in looking for a successor to Canterbury. On October 22 Newcastle despatched two letters to Archbishop Herring of York, one containing the formal offer of the translation, with the intimation that in case of his presumed acceptance Hutton of Bangor would succeed to York, and the other bringing the utmost pressure in favour of an affirmative answer. "I am sure you will consider what malicious interpretations would be put both at home and abroad by the king's enemies, if his majesty should find a difficulty in filling up the archbishopric of Canterbury according to his own inclinations and those of all his friends" (*ibid.*, ff. 34 and 35). Herring had been already twice forewarned on October 13 and 20 by his friend Lord Chancellor Hardwicke of the probability of this offer, and had replied on the 17th and 21st, begging that some other prelate might receive the honour. When the formal letter arrived from Newcastle, the northern primate suffered agonies of mind, and after writing "three letters of refusal," burned them, and resolved to accept the translation solely on the ground of the public embarrassment which a further *nolo archiepiscopari* would cause to the administration. Even so, he expressed to Hardwicke the hope that at this eleventh hour the king might be pleased to leave himself in peace at York and send Hutton to Canterbury (October 24, Add. MSS. 35598, f. 293, cp. ff. 283 and 291). On the same day Herring despatched two letters of acceptance, one formal and the other private, to his grace of Newcastle; so

that on October 24, a fortnight after the sudden death of Potter, the primacy had been accepted (S.P. 36, ff. 42 and 43). On October 27 Newcastle informed Sherlock with much relief that "the warrants for the two archbishops, Herring and Hutton, were signed that day" (*ibid.*, f. 46).

Such is the evidence of the surviving correspondence concerning the negotiations for filling the vacant see of Canterbury. From the time of the offer to Gibson on October 11 to that made to Herring on October 22 the sequence of events is clear, and affords no place for the tradition of an approach to Butler. Dr. Edmund Pyle, an industrious collector of gossip, indeed believed on October 17 that "London and Sarum will have the offer of the primacy, but 'tis taken for granted will decline the acceptance of it. Dr. Butler (of Bristol) is next spoken of; and if he should stick to his prospect of Durham (which would certainly please him better and is likely to fall every day) I see not but it may come, as everything else has done, to my Lord of York's door" (*Memoirs of a Royal Chaplain*, ed. A. Hartshorne, p. 127). The evidence of the letters of Newcastle, detailing his successive steps, contradicts this rumour so far as the period between October 11 and 22 is concerned. It seems clear, therefore, that, if the primacy were offered to Butler, it must have been immediately upon receipt of the news of the death of Potter and before the offer was made to Gibson. In this case it is at least remarkable that no mention of this first offer has survived in these contemporary records, especially in the considerable correspondence of the Duke of Newcastle dealing with this subject. It is perhaps also a trifle improbable that Butler would have been the subject of such an approach before the Bishops of London and Salisbury had been sounded as to their attitude in respect of the vacancy.

The argument from silence is notoriously precarious, and the slightest item of positive evidence must weigh considerably against an accumulation of probabilities based upon the uncertain testimony of a series of negatives. It is, however, difficult to conceive that the offer to Butler would have been made without the knowledge of the Duke of Newcastle, or that, if made without his privity, it would have remained a secret hidden from his ears. It is therefore very remarkable that in the several letters written by "the ecclesiastical minister" to his clerical and lay friends during the course of this negotiation, no mention should have been made at any time of the name of Butler as having been under serious consideration by the king and his advisers. With a reserved and taciturn minister of state this silence might have been less surprising; but to the student who has toiled through the almost interminable volume of

letters penned by Newcastle with the desire to detail each item of ecclesiastical preferment and to establish his personal influence in each episcopal promotion, it is a very difficult supposition to make that if his grace had known at the time or later of an offer of the primacy to Butler, he would have failed on any occasion to mention it to any one of his many correspondents. His silence upon this occasion would contrast markedly with his action in regard to the same prelate in a similar episode which occurred in the following year. In September, 1748, the see of London was vacant by the death of Gibson, whereupon "the king immediately named Butler to succeed him"; but Newcastle secured his majesty's leave to make a formal offer first to Sherlock in the confident expectation that he would decline. To the general surprise Sherlock returned an affirmative answer. So sure had the duke been of the bishop's refusal that he had written already a complimentary letter to Butler, assuring him that the prior offer to Sherlock had been made out of courtesy to his seniority and that upon receipt of the anticipated refusal, "it was his majesty's intention to remove him to the see of London" (Add. MSS. 32716, ff. 283 and 287). Current opinion was in general agreement with Dr. Pyle that Butler's heart was set on Durham; for Henry Pelham reported in this connection that "the talk of the Town is . . . that Butler would not take it . . . I believe the Bishop of Bristol casts a wishing eye for Durham" (Add. MSS. 32717, f. 23). To Durham, therefore, Butler was translated in 1750, amid further congratulatory letters from the Duke of Newcastle. It remains a strange and unusual phenomenon if an offer of the primacy to Butler in 1747 escaped altogether the avid pen of the ecclesiastical minister.

The parallel difficulty remains, however, of accounting for the rise of a tradition of Butler's refusal of the primacy. A suggestion in a letter from Bishop Sherlock to Sir Thomas Robinson of October 29, 1747, introduces the possibility of its origin in a reported proposal to translate the Bishop of Bristol to York in succession to Herring. In relating his own refusal of Canterbury, Sherlock observed: "When this was offered to me the D[uke of Newcastle] sent me word that if I declined it, York would be moved and Bristol sent to York; but you see Hutton goes to York. I remember that about two years ago the D[uke] told me that the Bishop of London, speaking of Canterbury, said he was too old, and Salisbury too old, but that [Herring] might move and Hutton go to York. Wether what is done be the effect of this scheme, or wether the Yorkshire interest has prevailed for Hutton, or wether Bristol is sure of Durham and desires to wait for it, I know not" (Historical Manuscripts Commission, 10th Report, Appendix I., p. 298). The fatal

objection to Sherlock's version here related is that during the negotiation he remained at Sarum and that the letter from Newcastle of October 15, pressing his acceptance of Canterbury after a first refusal, explicitly mentions the intention of the king to translate Hutton to York if Herring were promoted to Canterbury (S.P. 36, vol. 102, f. 19). Neither in the duke's letter to Sherlock nor in that to Herring of October 22 is the name of Butler mentioned as having been under consideration for succession to York. It seems improbable, therefore, that the tradition of Butler's refusal of a primatial see can have originated in the rumour that he might succeed Herring at Bishopthorpe; but the erroneous narrative of Sherlock in this regard suggests the possibility of similar error in the belief that Butler declined the primacy of Canterbury.

The chronological reconstruction of events between the offer to Gibson on October 11 and that to Herring on the 22nd therefore seems to leave no place for any offer to Butler during this period. If an offer were made, it may be inferred that it must have been before that to Gibson and immediately upon news of the sudden death of Potter on October 10. The possibility of such a step may not be denied; but the weight of evidence against it is considerable. Particularly impressive is the circumstance that no whisper of this offer finds record in any of the letters to and from the Duke of Newcastle to any of his correspondents, including Butler, upon this or any other occasion, although all the other prelates to whom the offer was in fact made are repeatedly mentioned by name. The sole evidence for the alleged offer is contained in the oral tradition handed down in the Butler family and printed by Bartlett nearly a century later. In view of the contrary negative evidence it must seem at least highly doubtful whether credence can be attached to the reported refusal by the philosopher-prelate of the Primacy of all England. But, if Butler did not decline either of the primatial sees of the *Ecclesia Anglicana* (and here is the unkindest cut of all), what becomes of the alleged reason for his *nolo archiepiscopari* which has adorned so many pious copy book exercises on the theme of the baseness of the Hanoverian church? Must the legend that "it was too late to try to support a falling church" pass into that extensive limbo of dissipated eighteenth-century chimeras which have no sufficient foundation in fact?

N. SYKES.

DR. MESSENGER AND ANGLICAN ORDERS

THE REFORMATION, THE MASS, AND THE PRIESTHOOD. By E. C. Messenger, Ph.D. Longmans. 18s.

The author of this book essays "to set forth a reasoned account of why the Catholic and Roman Church refuses to allow that Anglican clergy have the powers of the Catholic priesthood." It may at first sight seem strange that Roman theologians should still find it necessary to take pains to substantiate the statements of the Bull *Apostolicæ Curæ* forty years after its promulgation. Such an authoritative utterance might have been supposed to have settled the question once and for all from the Roman point of view; and it is difficult to see how fresh researches at so late a date can add to the weight of a pronouncement which claims to be no mere *obiter dictum* of Leo XIII., but to be a careful statement made with certain knowledge (*certa scientia*). The author has resisted the temptation to which Mgr. A. S. Barnes fell, to supplement the theory of a defect in intention in the Anglican Ordinal (the main contention of the Bull) by a theory of a breach in the English episcopal succession. In this he has been prudent: Mgr. Barnes's reconstruction of history received a swift quietus from the relentless pen of Dr. Claude Jenkins;* and the attempt to prove the non-consecration of Barlow seems to have now been discarded by Roman apologists, and to have joined the Nag's Head Fable in the limbo of legend. In fact, it is simply the statements of *Apostolicæ Curæ* that the author is concerned to defend; he has added himself to the number of those who have attempted (and, we may add, failed) to prove that the liturgical documents of the Anglican Church in the sixteenth century were drawn up with a view to the abolition of the Eucharistic sacrifice and the Catholic priesthood.

From a cursory glance at this volume of 570 pages, the comprehensive subject-matter of its chapters, its numerous citations, both English and Latin, and frequent reference to sixteenth-century documents, the reader may well expect to find a careful, scholarly, and even convincing defence of the Roman position. Further perusal, however, will make those expectations more dubious. When he sees that Dr. Darwell Stone is described as "formerly Warden (*sic*) of Pusey House," that Dr. Jenkins's name is spelled *Jenkyns* throughout, and that a Doctor of Divinity of thirty-one years' standing who is one of the most famous and distinguished promoters of Anglican theological scholarship is referred to as "Mr. Harris," he will

* *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. xxiv., October, 1922.

begin to doubt whether the author pays much attention to accuracy of detail. He will soon find that this slovenliness is not confined to nomenclature. Many of the Latin quotations are rendered unintelligible by misprints which even a moderately careful reading of the proofs could have obviated; indeed, it seems impossible that any author learned in the Latin tongue could have allowed those on p. 127 and p. 133 to stand. Nor does the author deal more happily with his citations from English works. A reference to the chrysom of the Baptismal Rite, taken from *Liturgy and Worship*, becomes a reference to the chrism;* a document familiar to liturgical scholars is renamed the "*Magdalene* Pontifical," as if it emanated from the University of Cambridge; while one of the standard works on the religious crisis of the sixteenth century is referred to (though not consistently) as "*Lollardry* and the Reformation." The method in which the author transcribes passages from the last work is certainly unusual, to say the least. We are told, for instance, that "Gairdner says expressly that these Ten Articles" (1536) "were elaborated out of the Wittenberg Articles." What is actually stated in Gairdner's *Lollardy* is: "Articles were agreed upon, differing altogether from the German set, though retaining in some passages a good deal of the same phraseology."† Once again, in a passage concerned with the Act promulgating the Six Articles of 1539, Gairdner is correctly quoted as stating: "Henry was not really half so much bent on putting down heretical opinions as the title of the Act would suggest"; but the words immediately following are significantly omitted: "but sacramental heresies he had always opposed, and at this time he was very much concerned to make it appear to the world that he was dead against them."‡

Apart from blunders of transcription and orthography, the author makes some startling statements in the course of the book. In connexion with the rubric (first found in the Order of Communion, 1548) which directs the consecration of a second Chalice, when the first does not suffice for the needs of the communicants, he writes: "Here we have a very important step in the transformation of the Mass from a Sacrifice to a Communion, for the Catholic Church has always taught that the twofold consecration is necessary, for the Sacrifice and consecration under one kind only has never been allowed."§ But "consecration under one kind only," in a strictly parallel form to that prescribed by the Order of Communion, is not merely

* P. 520. *Cf. Liturgy and Worship*, p. 177.
† P. 246. *Cf.* Gairdner, *Lollardy and the Reformation*, vol. ii., p. 317.
‡ P. 275. *Cf.* Gairdner, *op. cit.*, vol. ii., p. 205.
§ P. 364. Note that the parallel quoted is not that quoted by H. A. Wilson and discounted by Dr. Messenger.

"allowed," but directed by the Cautels of the Sarum Missal. "If he should have discovered poison to have been put in . . . the chalice . . . after consecration . . . he ought to prepare a chalice properly anew, and resume consecration of the Blood from that place, 'Likewise after supper.'" Dr. Messenger may not be familiar with the Sarum Missal; but he ought at least to know of the existence of a similar direction in the present Roman Missal, prescribing such reconsecration of the Chalice, if its contents are spilled or poisonously infected after the Words of Institution have been said.* Similarly also the author states that a rubric in the Book of 1549, directing the curate to instruct sick persons who are unable to receive the Sacrament that they may receive communion spiritually through repentance and faith, implies that "there is ultimately no difference between sacramental and spiritual communion."† "This rubric again is based on a direction in the Sarum Manual, by which the Priest in such case is directed to say: "Brother, in this case true faith and good will are sufficient for thee; only believe, and thou hast eaten."‡

Nor is the author more successful in his attempt to bring linguistic nuances to the aid of his thesis. He notes, for instance, that the Continental Reformers habitually used the term *exhiberi* in their statements of the doctrine of the Eucharistic Presence; and wherever that term occurs in Anglican documents he scents Zwinglianism, even in such a rigidly orthodox doctrinal statement as that of the Ten Articles. "The Church," Dr. Messenger informs us, "never makes use of the term 'exhibited' in her own exposition of the doctrine."§ Actually the term is used more than once by Aquinas, who says that "Christ in this sacrament shows (*exhibet*) to us his flesh in an invisible manner,"‖ and "It is convenient . . . that Christ's body be shown (*exhibeatur*) separately to the faithful as food, and his blood as drink." The same term is used in reference to the Real Presence in the *Enchiridion* of Cologne (1537),¶ which the author recognizes as a "well-balanced and carefully phrased statement of Catholic doctrine."**

We turn next to a more serious mistake. Dr. Messenger's main contention is that the language and structure of the Ordinal shews that the intention of its compilers was to create a ministry entirely distinct in its nature and functions from that of the

* The Cautel of the Sarum Missal is quoted as given in E. A. L. Clarke, *People's Missal*, first edition, p. 429. The modern rubric cited will be found in *Missale Romanum*, in the section entitled *De Defectibus circa*, Missam occurrentibus, x., 6 and 13.

† P. 398.
‡ Text in Maskell, *Monumenta Ritualia*, vol. i., p. 89.
§ P. 210.
‖ *Summa Theologica*, iii., Q. 75, Art. 1, and Q. 76, Art. 2.
¶ Paris, 1550, p. 76.
** P. 187.

pre-Reformation Church. The Ordinal, it is maintained, being based on the rite contained in Bucer's *De legitima Ordinatione*, is imbued throughout with Lutheran ideas. In support of this thesis, he calls attention to the phrase, "Take thou aucthoritie," said at the laying on of hands. "Authority to execute an office," it is maintained, is something different from the power (*potestas*) which is conferred at Ordination in the ancient rites,* and the language of the Anglican Ordinal is therefore consistent with the Lutheran theory that at Ordination no real powers were conferred, but merely the right to exercise certain functions. Dr. Messenger has appealed to Bucer; to Bucer we will go: and we find that, however inadequate his views upon the ministry, he did believe that a definite power was conferred through the laying on of hands. "The imposition of hands . . . signifies that to him (who is ordained) is given power (*potestatem*) that he may teach and govern the Church in the place of Christ (*vice Christi*)."† However inadequate this statement in its omission of reference to the sacramental functions of the ministry (an omission which cannot be imputed to the Anglican Ordinal), it shews that Bucer certainly believed that "power" was conferred at Ordination, and not only the "right to exercise an office." In any case a comparison of the English of the XXIIIrd Article with the original Latin makes clear that "authority" is the normal translation for *potestas* in this context. Where the English version speaks of "Men who have publick authority given unto them in the Congregation to call and send Ministers into the Lord's vineyard," the Latin is "quibus *potestas* vocandi ministros atque mittendi in vineam Domini publice concessa est in Ecclesia." We may conclude, therefore, that all Latin versions of the Ordinal have been accurate in rendering "Take thou authority . . . to minister the holy Sacraments" ("Accipe potestatem . . . administrandi sancta Sacramenta").

Dr. Messenger also makes some play with the Ordinal's use of the phrase "admitted" (to the priesthood, etc.), and by his use of invert-commas or italics wherever this word occurs, seems to imply that this phrase does not signify true ordination, but merely the bestowal on certain persons of jurisdiction to exercise priestly powers which (on the Lutheran theory) they already possessed. He does not revive Estcourt's statement that "admitted" is "a perfectly novel word that came in with the Lutheran doctrine," though he seems to be anxious to assert the conclusion which Estcourt draws from that statement. This unusual reticence is perhaps due to the author's reading of

* P. 458 and *passim*.

† *De Ordinatione Legitima Ecclesiæ Ministrorum Revocanda*. In *Scripta Anglicana Martini Buceri*, Basle, 1577, p. 255.

Dr. Firminger's article in *Liturgy and Worship*, where it is shewn that the phrase "admitti ad ordines" is used for the process of Ordination by the Council of Lambeth, 1330. In any case it is hard to see how the phrase "admitted to the priesthood" can be reconciled with the Lutheran view that all Christians are priests in the full sense of the word.*

The Preface to the Ordinal makes it abundantly clear that the intention of its compilers was not to create a new "Evangelical" ministry, nor merely to revive a form of ministry which supposedly had existed in apostolic days, but had since been lost to the Church. Their explicit intention was to "continue" those Orders which had been in Christ's Church "from the Apostles' time," and not merely a ministry which they conceived to have existed *in* the Apostles' time. Dr. Messenger's statement that Cranmer "intends to make bishops, priests, and deacons as, in his opinion, they were in the beginning, and as they ought to be, and not as they had been regarded under the Roman corruption"† is contradicted by the plain statement of the Preface in the light of which the Ordinal must be interpreted. It is true that that Preface nowhere states explicitly that the three Orders are of divine institution. In spite of the Council of Trent few responsible New Testament scholars would assert that the three Orders of the ministry were instituted by Christ in precisely the form in which they came to be recognized in the early Church. That Christ is the Author of the Ministry is sufficiently emphasized in the *Ordering of Priests* by the appointed Gospels and by the prayer containing the words: "who, after he . . . was ascended into heaven, sent abroad into the world his Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Doctors and Pastors." It is equally true that the Preface does not say that the three Orders are "absolutely necessary." But this defect is supplied by the first rubric, which enjoins "an exhortation declaring . . . how necessary such Orders are in the Church of Christ."‡

Nor can it be assessed as sheer loss to the Anglican Ordinal that the compilers largely abandoned the rites of the Pontifical. Liturgiologists agree that the Latin Ordination rite in its developed form is a highly confused composition, "full of beautiful elements thrown together with a want of harmony and arrangement which actually involves serious doctrinal misstatement."§ That there is a close relation between the Anglican rite of Ordination and the draft contained in Bucer's work cannot be doubted; and we need not enter into the vexed question as

* See *Liturgy and Worship*, p. 671. † P. 459.

‡ The rubric is quoted in the form of the 1550 Ordinal.

§ *Church Quarterly Review*, January, 1878. Article, "The Anglican Form of Ordination," p. 265.

to whether the suggestions of *De legitima Ordinatione* formed a first draft for the compilers of the 1550 Ordinal, or a series of comments for the benefit of the revisers of 1552. What is most remarkable is that, in spite of Bucer's influence on the Anglican Reformers, neither Ordinal adopted the inadequate formula which he prescribed to be said at the laying on of hands—viz., "The hand of God almighty, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, protect and govern you, that ye may go and bring forth much fruit by your ministry, and that it may remain unto life eternal."* Both Ordinals retained the form, "Receive the Holy Ghost," in spite of the repudiation of those words, as appropriate to Ordination, by Luther and Calvin alike. Moreover, the Anglican Ordinal differs essentially from the Bucerian rite in that it provides three distinct and separate services for the conferment of the three Orders. Bucer provides only one rite, and merely suggests that at the making of a "Superintendent or Bishop, all things should be done at somewhat greater length and with more dignity (*aliquanto pluribus et gravius*)," while between the forms of Ordination used in the case of "presbyters of the second or third grade" there should be some distinction (*non nullum discrimen*).* Instead of the vague formula of Ordination and still vaguer distinctions drawn between the three Orders conferred, which Bucer favoured, we find in the Anglican rite prayers, scripture readings, and form of commission at the imposition of hands, carefully arranged so as to throw the distinction between the three Orders into relief, and to describe the functions of each Order as fully as they are described in the New Testament.

For there remained a greater influence than Bucer on the Anglican Ordinal—the influence of Holy Scripture. "Whatever the grace which was given to Timothy by the laying on of the Apostles' hands, that the Church desired to give to her bishops."† Anyone familiar with the scriptural references to Timothy and the interpretation placed thereon by sixteenth-century divines will discount Dr. Messenger's gibe that there is nothing in the Anglican rite for the consecration of a bishop "which could not be said for any clergyman or gospel preacher." In fact, the Paraphrase of Erasmus, ordered in 1549 to be set up in every English church, explains the crucial sentence, "Stir up the gift of God, which thou hast received through the imposition of hands, when thou wast made bishop (*episcopus ordinatus accepisti*)."‡

And "whatever the Lord meant to impart to His Apostles by the words recorded by St. John, that the Church desired to

* *De Ord leg.*, edit. cit., p. 259.
† *C.Q.R.*, art. cit., p. 272.
‡ Quoted, *ibid.*, p. 273 *f.*

impart to her priests."* In this connexion we may draw attention to the form "Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven." Once more we appeal to the teaching of Bucer, the alleged sole influence on the Anglican Ordinal. For Bucer himself interprets these words as conveying definite priestly powers. "He does not say, Whose sins ye declare to have been forgiven, but Whose sins ye forgive. . . . For by Baptism the sons of God are washed from their sins; and that cleansing, and the forgiveness of all sins which are afterwards committed, are confirmed and shewn forth by the Eucharist, by Absolution, and by every ministration of the Gospel and holy prayer."†

It is maintained, however, that the Ordinal contains no allusion to the power of sacrifice inherent in the priesthood, and is therefore defective in intention. We have just seen reason to suppose that the formula, "Whose sins ye forgive" has reference to the Eucharist as well as to the power of Absolution; and the ordained priest is commissioned to be a dispenser of God's holy Sacraments. But it is urged that this is not enough; for the Reformers are alleged to have held defective views on the Eucharistic sacrifice. Now it is clear that the successive liturgies of the sixteenth century regard the Communion rite as in some sense a Sacrifice. But the rites never make explicit the precise nature of the Sacrifice; they may imply a real Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, or merely a commemorative offering "of praise and thanksgiving," in recollection of the full, perfect and sufficient Sacrifice once offered on the Cross. But precisely this ambiguity is found in the early liturgies; indeed, the language of the Roman Canon itself is perfectly capable of being interpreted in accordance with virtualist or even receptionist views. The doctrine that in the Eucharist the Body and Blood of Christ, really present beneath the forms of bread and wine, are offered in sacrifice to the Father, may be the rightful theological conclusion from the fact that the Church has historically regarded the Eucharist as the divinely instituted Sacrifice which has replaced all others; but this conclusion is nowhere made explicit in early liturgies. That it is likewise not made explicit in the Edwardine liturgies cannot be alleged to invalidate them. Nor can the direction against the comparatively late Western practice of elevating the elements at consecration be interpreted as a denial of the Real Presence. Of the rite which contained that rubric, in fact, Bishop Gardiner stated: "Of the truth of the very presence of Christ's most precious Body and Blood in the sacrament, there was as much spoken in that book as might be desired." (Dr. Messenger's

* *C.Q.R.*, art. cit., p. 272.

† *De Vi et Usu Sacri Ministerii.* Bucer, edit. cit., p. 542.

attempt to discredit this judgment as merely made with a view to secure Gardiner's release from prison does not carry conviction.*) The "godliness" of the first book was affirmed in the revision of 1552; and it may be said that the rubric directing reconsecration (against which Dr. Messenger has raised an objection which we have seen to be groundless) may logically be taken to imply that the Words of Institution do effect some change in the elements consecrated.

Nevertheless, it can be proved from their writings that Cranmer and other individual Reformers held defective views concerning the Sacrament; and it is the chief contention of the Bull of Leo XIII. that the Ordinal is defective in intention, since it contains "no clear mention of the sacrifice, of consecration, of the *sacerdotium*, of the power of consecrating and offering sacrifice." (The charge that there is no reference to the priesthood [*sacerdotium*] in the Ordinal is so clearly false, that the Latin word had to stand untranslated in the English versions of the Bull.) It is urged that a valid Ordination of a priest must contain an explicit reference to the "power of offering sacrifice."

In this particular the intention of the Reformers cannot justly be impugned. Their intention was to delegate to the ordained Ministers of the Church precisely those powers which had been exercised by the Apostolic ministry. And no form of words can be found more suitable to describe a member of such a ministry than "a faithful Dispenser of the Word of God and of his holy Sacraments." It may (we believe justly) be claimed that a "minister of the Sacraments" is also a "sacrificing priest." But the latter title is implied in the former; the power to offer sacrifice is not something which is distinct and separate from the function of "ministering the Sacrament." The essence of the Christian ministry is to be found in the power to preach the Word and to dispense the Sacraments; and we believe that unprejudiced readers of the New Testament will recognize these as the essential functions performed by the Apostolic ministry. Unless one believes that St. Peter and St. Paul regarded the essence of their Apostolic functions as aptly described by such a phrase as "the power to offer sacrifice and to celebrate Masses as well for the quick as for the dead," one is forced to the conclusion that the Anglican Form of Ordination is adequate and valid. A belief that the Apostles thought of themselves as primarily and essentially sacrificing priests finds no support in the pages of the New Testament.

Last of all, nothing that Dr. Messenger can allege concerning the defective views of Cranmer and other Reformers concerning

* See p. 413 *f.*

the Holy Sacrifice has the least bearing on the question of the intention of the Ordinal. To confer a Sacrament with the right intention, it is necessary for the Minister, using the appropriate Form and Matter, to have the intention of doing what the true Church instituted by Christ does. Provided he has this intention, erroneous views concerning the nature of the Sacrament which he administers do not affect its validity. In this connexion it is worth while to quote the words of the late Dr. Adrian Fortescue: "People who are not theologians never seem to understand how little *intention* is wanted for a sacrament. . . . The 'implicit intention of doing what Christ instituted' means so vague and small a thing that one can hardly help having it—unless one deliberately excludes it. At the time when everyone was talking about Anglican Orders, numbers of Catholics confused *intention* with *faith*. Faith is not wanted. It is heresy to say that it is. . . . A man may have utterly wrong, heretical, and blasphemous views about a sacrament and yet confer or receive it quite validly."* Dr. Messenger has added himself to the "numbers of Catholics" guilty of this confusion. But it is only fair to allow that in so doing he has followed Leo XIII.'s example.

This book cannot be said to have rendered the Roman view on Anglican Orders one whit more convincing, unless indeed one regards a lavish use of the italics and exclamation-marks, which are the principal weapons of the anti-Anglican armoury, as satisfactory substitutes for solid scholarship and historical research. What light it throws on the value of the *Nihil Obstat* of the Censor Deputatus!

HUMPHRY BEEVOR.

THE RELEVANCE OF THE CHURCH*

NOT long after the publication of Canon Barry's book on *The Relevance of Christianity*, the author met a well-known divine in Oxford who greeted him with these words: "That task was comparatively easy; what you have to do next is much more difficult—to explain what is the relevance of the Church." In the book under consideration Canon Barry has attempted this task. By comparison with its predecessor it is, in our opinion, a weaker book; possibly we had expected too much, and so when we come to lay the book down it is with a feeling of dissatisfaction and disappointment; problems have been raised without being solved and theories put forward without being proved. It may

* *The Relevance of the Church*, being a paper read before the Winchester (Rural) Society of Sacred Study, by F. R. Barry. Nisbet, 7s. 6d.

be that other gifts are necessary besides a deep and earnest sincerity in one who has any right to be described as "the Church's greatest prophet." But negative criticism is at once easy and unprofitable, and with these preliminary remarks we may pass to those matters which are of vital importance and to the application of which Canon Barry has some contribution to make, if only by making us think.

It has been remarked that in the world of today "there are a number of different Jerusalems; there is the Muscovite Jerusalem which has no temple, there is Hitler's Jerusalem which has no Jews, and there is the Jerusalem of the social reformers which is all suburbs; but none of these is Blake's Jerusalem, still less that city which the Apostle saw descending out of heaven like a bride adorned for her husband. All these New Jerusalems are earthly cities established by the power and will of man";* against these stands an otherworldly sacramental society, the Church of Christ, founded and to be established by the power and will of God, an "act of God" as Barry puts it, in the world as the "vital nucleus of community perfected in God." And the great question we have to answer is whether that religion which we have inherited, embodied as it is in the Christian "ekklesia," and inextricably interwoven with the pattern of thought, emotion and conduct which prevailed in nineteenth-century society—can this religion survive the disintegration of that society and the explosion of the doctrine of Progress which we are witnessing in our own day? Does it contain within itself such vital and creative resources that it may lead us into a new future amidst tasks, conditions, and opportunities undreamed of yet in our philosophy? In a word, is the Christian Church an anachronism, or can it adapt itself to those fundamental conditions of every community which vary from age to age? These are the questions which Canon Barry asks and seeks to answer, and we may perhaps summarize them more concretely as follows: First, what does the world expect of the Church? Second, what has the Church to give to the world as it at present exists? Third, how may the Church give it?

1. Apart from the large number of those who are frankly indifferent, there would seem to be two classes of people with whom we are concerned. There are those who look upon the Church as providing religion for those who want it; according to each man's taste this religion will be of various brands, and if none seems to suit them they will ignore it altogether. Religion has in fact become for many merely a matter of opinion, and for a still larger number something that is irrelevant and

* Dawson, *Religion and the Modern State*, p. 109.

out of date. "People have the materials for doubt, but not the new foundations for confidence."* Basing their conclusions on third-rate exponents, they have come to assume that Christianity is bound up with certain theories of scriptural interpretation and miracles—theories which, as Barry points out, all educated Christians repudiate—and it is popularly thought that the abandonment of these beliefs is an inevitable antecedent to abandonment of all belief in God. The man-in-the-street never realizes that what has really broken down is not Christian Faith in God, but those false, crude, and unworthy ideas of Him by which we have too long limited or debased it. For him, Christianity has ceased to be a Faith, he has made it into a religion, and reduced its content to codes and conventions based on expediency and concerned only with ethical precepts. With such people Christ's appeal must inevitably fail; and we can only deplore the well-intentioned efforts of so-called broadminded ecclesiastics who try to water down the moral and intellectual demands of the Christian Gospel to suit the convenience of these people, thereby robbing that Gospel of its basic roots and endangering the future of that Church of which they are members.

There is, however, another class of outsider—the intelligent, sincere, sometimes young, seeker after truth. In the case of this type of person Dr. Inge's prophecy is coming increasingly true, that theism when expelled by the door invariably comes in by the window. For he realizes that as a pleasure-garden this world fails, as it was never meant to be a pleasure-garden, and he sees that there must be something in an institution which has achieved so much in the last hundred years in the way of missionary expansion, enrichment of worship and buildings, and development of scholarship and thought; he certainly will not agree with Canon Barry's amazingly exaggerated dictum that English-speaking Christianity can meet the best thought of the twentieth century and outthink it. But he realizes the truth of Disraeli's remark that comfort is not civilization, and that the greatness of civilization in the future will depend, as it has done in the past, on its Christianity, that the trouble with the world is that civilization has no centre and that the casting off of ultimate conviction has only resulted in emptiness and a vague sterility of thought. Man striving to substitute belief in himself for belief in God now believes in neither, and so humanistic idealism has broken down. The Totalitarian State is, it is true, an attempt to relate politics, economics, and ethics to one another once more; but thoughtful people with a few exceptions see the downhill direction in which this system is leading, away from freedom to servitude and loss of personality; they are tired of an

* Matthews, *Essays in Construction*, p. 109.

experimental subjectivism, whether in the realm of morals or religion; they are realizing that on the victory of Christianity depends the future of civilization, and they look to the Church to provide them with that vital, convincing Gospel which alone can give them a purpose to live for, and the knowledge of a Power that can redeem and restore to faith, fellowship, and freedom. In a word, they see the necessity of Christ, and they are quickly coming to see that apart from the Church there can be no Gospel of Christ. They do not want a mere ethical religion, for they see only too well that if Christianity is no more than a moral religion, then Socrates was the saviour, and no law apart from a personal lawgiver can ever be a proper object of reverence; nor do they want a religion which kowtows to science, for they realize that, in Dr. Temple's words, science is no more the best of aids for determining a man's personal relation to his God than it is in helping a child to determine its relation to its father; they want a definite, objective, authoritative Faith, which is not afraid to direct them in the art of living, and it is on its faithfulness to its mission to provide this in no hesitating, timid fashion that the future of the Church depends. This has brought us to our second question—What has the Church to give to the world?

2. Canon Barry quotes the remark of a well-known statesman of the last century—"They must have a Church"; the speaker was referring to the growing Commonwealth of Australia, and we confess to a temptation to ask him why. If our imagination serves us aright, his answer would be somewhat as follows: "To provide entertaining services on State occasions, and in general to forward the interests of the Empire by promoting goodwill among men." It is precisely this kind of view of religion, in which the service of man has superseded the worship of God, and which has never heard of Von Hügel's dictum that religion is adoration, which dominates much popular thought today, and creates the common idea that Christianity and Churchianity are two entirely separate things. It possibly accounts for that cleavage between clergy and laity which Barry so rightly deplores. And the only way to bridge the gulf is, not by modifying the claims of the Christian Gospel, nor, in the words of the Bishop of Winchester, by "trimming and reducing it to meet the objections of a critical or indifferent age,"* by cutting out the Atonement and all ideas of Redemption which are concerned with that unfashionable subject of sin, but by stating simply and more definitely than ever that we have a Revelation from above, not a mere ethical system, or in a word what the Church is and what it stands for.

* *A Call to Christians*, p. 36.

"The message of Jesus is not primarily a calling of individuals to a moral and spiritual reformation of life, but a call to enter into an order of salvation which God has prepared to deliver man from what the Bible calls Idolatry—whether the graven image be Power, Success, Money or Comfort. Christ died on the Cross and rose again to save man from himself and to redeem him to God."* So the Church is in the world to redeem it, not to be ministered unto, but to minister; it is charged with a Gospel of God to proclaim, a Faith to present, without which all freedom dies. It is the organ of Christ's work in the world, through which alone Christ's redemption of the social order can be effected. The Sacred is to redeem the Secular; in Barry's words, "the family, the professions, the council chamber are themselves the material of churchmanship; it is, incidentally, in connection with this that Barry advocates the system of voluntary clergy. Sociologically, the Church is the defender of the value of human personality; against all State interference with the rights of the individual, the Church is bound to protest that the State is the instrument of personality, not the end for which persons exist. Barry insists that to the Communist's enthusiastic claim, "We are changing the world," and to the Fascist cry, "We worship the State," Christians must equally enthusiastically cry round their altars, "We believe in God the Father," claiming equally forcefully that only as men are reconciled to God can they be reconciled to one another. Again, it has been one of the duties of the Church to demonstrate its belief in the Fatherhood of God by stirring the Christian conscience to fight against all social evils, and in our own day to encourage and support all such ventures as unemployment centres and slum clearance schemes. Too often has the attitude of individual members of the Church towards these justified the taunt that the Church exists merely to maintain the *status quo*. Christians should, for instance, state quite clearly that what in industrial and business circles today is commonly called enterprise is in reality greed, and what is termed economy invariably avarice.† Barry makes the practical suggestion that the Church might well make greater use of the Press, the cinema, and the stage to set a Christian tone to social problems, to stress the fact that "the Church stands as the witness against the world of the right of a man to be treated as a human being."‡

We are, however, in danger of falling into the error of Canon Barry if we limit the purpose of the Church to vital though incidental works of mercy such as these. To Canon Barry the importance of the Church seems to lie in its "relevance"; we

* Hebert, *Liturgy and Society*, p. 149; *cf.* p. 184.
† *Cf.* Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, p. 60. ‡ Hebert, p. 158.

humbly suggest that its relevance or irrelevance is of no real concern; the pragmatic test may appeal to the imagination, it can never satisfy the intellect. What matters infinitely more than the relevance of the Church is the truth of the Church; if the Church is merely relevant it need not necessarily be true, and only if the Christian doctrine of the Church is true can its relevance be either desirable or inevitable.

By its very nature, as Father Hebert has so rightly insisted, the Church can offer no ready-made solutions for difficulties of belief, morals, or social life, "for the grace of orders does not confer on the clergy nor does Baptism confer on the ordinary Christian a clearer insight into economic problems than is possessed by non-Christian students of economics";* all it can and should offer is a share in a common faith and a common conflict against evil, of help in the conflict. Emerson was right when he wrote that God offers to every man the choice of truth or repose; take which you please: you cannot have both. We do well to remember Christopher Dawson's warning that there is a real danger that English religion, at least English Protestantism, may allow itself to become identified with an enthusiasm for social justice and reform which is hardly distinguishable from the creed of secular humanitarianism; English religion is sometimes in danger of forgetting that civilization is a road by which man travels, not a house for him to dwell in; his true city is elsewhere.† And so the Church exists to proclaim that God has made a way to man; in contrast to the world which makes God the sought, Christianity makes Him the seeker, treating men and women as sinners who may be made saints. Before ever men can talk of "applying Christianity," men must repent; to be saved without being converted is impossible. Hence to hold its members the Church must demand something of them; it must give up its constant apologizing for itself, and proclaim the knowledge of Jesus Christ boldly and uncompromisingly, regardless of whether it will thereby offend the conventional, self-satisfied, and respectable standards of life around it. We may well dissent from Barry's judgment that "if Anglicanism fails the world now, it is no other form of Christianity which will win its allegiance, but paganism"; such a statement reflects that insularity of outlook which is the bane of the Church of England and ignores the remarkable progress which the Roman Catholic Church is making in its life-or-death struggle on the Continent and elsewhere. But it remains true that the Church is on its trial now to an extent far greater than ever it was in the days of its early persecution, that the issues now are far more vital, and that it is no vague undenominational version of

* Hebert, p. 197.

† Dawson, p. 108, xv.

the Gospel of Christ that will survive; the young are not satisfied by the kind of religion which Canon Barry prescribes for them; wearied of subjective experiments, they desire an objective, authoritative, all-or-nothing, take-it-or-leave-it, challenging religion, and on the success of the Church in providing this depends the issue whether mechanization or spirit will prevail in the civilization that is to come. In the last century the belief that Christianity consisted solely in belief in the ethical ideals of Christ fitted well into the currently accepted belief in the idea of Progress. Now this latter belief has been shattered, and the future of the Church depends on the extent to which it can shew itself to be the guardian of something far more valuable than a mere code of ethics—namely, a Revelation. This brings us to our final question—How can the Church, which admittedly contains within itself all that the world really and validly needs, give to the world that which alone can save it?

3. "The present age with its manifold divisions, confusions, and distractions can hardly be an age of theological synthesis," so Father Hebert alleges;* "there are," he continues, "many questions which *we* are not capable of answering satisfactorily. It is rather for us to take no thought for the harvest, but only for the proper sowing; for before we can tackle the questions adequately, we need ourselves to become different; we need to draw together and find a spiritual unity. To the world, then, the message of the Church must be of this nature: "You can only find that spiritual unity by confessing the Christian Faith in God and bringing your gifts into the Church's common life." This is done in the supreme activity for which the Church exists, the worship of God. With the salutary warning that a full church is not by any means a guarantee of true worship and the practice of the Christian Faith, Barry proceeds to an admirable chapter on the theology of Worship. Worship alone can give men the Visio Dei; by worship man responds to the grace of God and hallows God's name, and in worship alone are men admitted through Christ to communion with God's redemptive activity in the world. Of this worship, the Eucharist is the norm, stressing as it does the facts of Grace, Forgiveness, Reconciliation, and the offering of ourselves through Jesus Christ, whose Real Presence in the Eucharist is assured through His presence in His Church. Once the primacy of worship is recognized—and by this we do not mean the primacy of Sung Matins and Litany at 11 o'clock—all problems of morality, individual and social, will automatically be solved. It follows that in a world which is not Christian it is not one of the Church's functions to try to enforce a universal Christian morality, for

* *Ibid.*, p. 12.

where the Temple of God has become a preaching house and praise has given way to edification, there the root of the Christian Gospel, Adoration, has been lost.

Bishop Gore once wrote that "the Church of England is an ingeniously devised instrumentality for defeating the objects which it is supposed to promote." And we are bound to confess that some of Canon Barry's suggestions as to how the Church may fulfil its mission in the world seem to us to confirm this dictum. He maintains that an ethic presented in terms of rules must be out of date because it will always reflect the condition of the period in which it was formulated, not that of contemporary life. But Christian morality is essentially a God-given thing, not a man-chosen one; and to make the hard case a justification for a universal lowering of the Christian traditional standard will invite the scorn and ridicule of all those who are inclined to take the Christian Faith seriously. It will further bring about the embarrassing situation of a number of individuals basing their conduct on a moral standard higher than that officially advocated and taught as Christ's by His Church. Canon Barry states that some twentieth-century demands are in accordance with the mind of Christ, and the Church must therefore encourage and allow them; he instances contraception; one can only say that it would be interesting to hear the comments of such great Christians as St. Bernard, St. Francis, St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Francis de Sales, and St. Ignatius Loyola on this statement. Canon Barry prophesies, too, that within the next hundred years there will be a regular ministry of women. We can only point out that the best Christian women seem to be the last people to desire this sacerdotal elevation for themselves, and state our opinion that both these irregular proposals if carried out would, so far from advancing the cause of Christ, hinder and hold up that cause for years to come.

By concentration on its worship, by purifying and ennobling it, will the Church once more attract the best minds of our time; in this field a certain variety from one age to another is not only desirable but necessary, for while Christian doctrine is something which, though it can develop, cannot by its very nature vary in content or be modified to suit different ages, yet in the expression of that doctrine, that is in worship, details are bound to call for constant revision, and it is here that Canon Barry has some profitable suggestions to guide us. First, he insists on the importance of externals, that beauty in design and decoration and dignity in ceremonial are vital necessities to create the right atmosphere for worship. Even at the risk of giving offence, we should remove all ugly and slovenly objects from our churches. Equally profitable is his second suggestion

that a service should be one intelligent and connected whole; too often do hymns, prayers, lessons, psalms and sermon follow one another in a wholly disconnected sequence. He suggests that every service should have one theme running through to which all constituent parts of the service are relevant; if necessary we are to revive our right contained in the Homilies of departing from the regular lections. Further, he advocates a greater use of periods of silence. It is perhaps hardly necessary to say that Barry's main object would certainly be better secured by a Liturgical Revival, the elements of which are admirably set forth in Father Hebert's *Liturgy and Society*, and the essence of which consists in concentration on the supreme importance of Eucharistic worship; in this connection may we suggest that nothing but good would result from a renewed and practical insistence on the duty, obligation, and privilege of regular Christian worship on all who claim membership of Christ's Church. There is very grave danger in the increasing popularity of High Mass where this is only due to its being prettier or more interesting than Sung Matins. We do well to remember that discipline is quite as fundamental an ingredient of Catholicism as are doctrine and ceremonial.

Canon Barry also sees a great future for that type of service which, apart from a few suitable prayers, consists of a long discursive sermon on a big subject of faith or conduct, not, for example, on the value of prayer, but on how to pray, not on the value of worship, but on how to worship. He prefers that the more natural terminus to such a sermon should be "Let us pray," rather than a long peroration beginning "And now."

Hymns, too, are of great teaching value; Barry thinks *Songs of Praise* would double a congregation in two months; if this be so, it is most undesirable, for, as Father Hebert points out, "this hymn-book entirely reflects the obsolete teachings of Liberal Theology and makes judicious omissions and alterations in many of the familiar hymns which speak of redemption; it, in fact, presages a corruption in our liturgical tradition, which is all the more lamentable because the words people say or sing make a far deeper impression than those they hear from the pulpit."* Hymns, therefore, are of great importance, but it may well be that we shall have to discard many which the older members of the congregation love and the younger scorn, because they convey inadequate, unworthy, and sometimes wrong ideas of the God whom we worship, revealed in Jesus Christ.

Canon Barry insists, further, that we want far more theology from the pulpit—"theology that will enable the common man

* *Ibid.*, p. 225.

to understand the theological language of the New Testament and see it in relation to his own daily life";* there is in the world, as Emil Brunner has reminded us, much "awareness of" and "feeling for" God, but very little knowledge of Him.† The world is not tired of theology, it is tired of bad theology; and it is not those services which are non-theological—*e.g.*, those provided by the B.B.C.—which are answering the real problems today nor capturing the best minds in the Church, nor converting the best minds in the world. Of all accessories of worship we should ask ourselves not "Do we like them?" but "Are the underlying ideas true?"

Such are some of the outstanding characteristics of Canon Barry's interesting and thought-provoking book. In his concluding paragraph he emphasizes a fundamental point which any consideration of a theme such as his is liable to obscure. The Church, he concludes, is not a mere idea, but a Body in which the Living Christ is Incarnate; it must penetrate and not merely increase; thus no mere extension of membership, nor even the achievement of Reunion, is an adequate aim for believers in the Church. Its task is to redeem the world's life; the less it thinks about itself and the greater its concern for this task, the more will it be true to its vocation, which is, in F. D. Maurice's phrase, to bring men to recognize Christ as the true centre of their fellowships. So the Father's will shall be done, on earth as it is in Heaven, and Christ shall be exalted in victory.

E. A. MAYCOCK.

WORLD EVANGELIZATION‡

"Now Joshua was old and stricken in years; and the Lord said unto him, Thou art old and stricken in years, and there remaineth yet very much land to be possessed."§ What the Lord said to Joshua, might He not very well say to the Church today: "Thou art old and stricken in years, and still the Promised Land is not yours, and there remaineth yet very much land to be possessed." Is it that the Church is in her dotage, too old, like Joshua, to complete the conquest begun in earlier days, too feeble to drive out the Canaanites and take possession of the inheritance given to her by her Lord? Is the evangelization of mankind beyond her power?

* Hebert, p. 159. † Brunner, *The Mediator*, p. 13.

‡ This article is an amplification of a sermon preached at St. Mark's Church, Southampton, on S.P.G. Sunday, 1935.

§ Joshua xiii. 1.

To Dr. Arnold a hundred years ago it seemed as if the Church was not only old and feeble, but actually dead. "On Easter Day," he was fond of saying, "I remember a living Friend; on Whit Sunday a dead Friend."* The Church, born into the world on the Feast of Pentecost, he mourned as a dead Friend.

Well, much has happened since the great headmaster went to his rest; the Church is still with us, and, thank God, is alive and active. True, the infirmities common to old age still cling to her—slowness to move, a tendency to be over-conservative and cautious and to let things go on as they have done—unwillingness for sacrifice and adventure, and, above all, too great absorption in the needs of the homeland. But she is awake and moving; and slowly but surely she is taking possession of the land left too long in the hands of the enemy.

"The chief sign of life in the Church is a missionary spirit. To this rule there is no exception. Missionary work may be done anywhere, in English cities and villages, as well as in remote countries, in print, by the spoken word, or by the witness of a faithful life; but the servant who does none of it, who hides his talent in the earth, is in all circumstances a wicked and slothful servant."

With these warning words of the Dean of Exeter† ringing in our ears, we turn to the main subject which is to engage our attention. As a preliminary we will first try to form some estimate of the place occupied by Christianity among the religions of the world. In other words, how many Christians are there in existence at the present time? Only a very general answer to this question can be expected, and for this among other reasons, that there is no agreement as to who should and who should not be reckoned as Christians.

Whitaker's Almanack (1935) puts the total number of living Christians as 692,400,000. According to the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, the Christian population of the world in 1875 was estimated at 394 millions, and fifty years later as exceeding 500 millions. "A very elaborate inquiry and investigation recently made," so it was stated in the *Homiletic Review* (May, 1910), "estimates the number of Christians now living at 477,080,158." The same tables, it was added, "estimate that at the close of the first century there were 500,000 adherents to Christianity," and that at the close of the nineteenth century Christian adherents not only outnumbered any other faith, but were "nearly double even the largest of the others."

* Dr. S. C. Carpenter in *Church and People*, 1789-1889, p. 427. Here let me say that for much of what follows I am greatly indebted to this work of the Dean of Exeter.

† S. C. Carpenter, *ibid.*, p. 427.

The figures quoted are, of course, very conjectural and uncertain, but all the estimates agree in one respect, that from the first days there has been an enormous increase in the number of professing Christians; and it is specially encouraging to us to be told by good authorities that the rate of progress in the last century has in no wise declined. Thus Bishop Lightfoot, speaking at the annual meeting of S.P.G. in 1875, demolished a then common impression by shewing, "with his patient and learned accuracy," that the progress of Christianity had been as rapid in the nineteenth century as it was in the first four centuries. A German writer, Dr. H. Weinel, of Tübingen, goes further. He said in 1907: "The advances of Christianity in its early days were small and slow compared with its recent growths and the work of modern missions. The most signal expansion of Christianity belongs not to the first but to the nineteenth century."*

There would seem, then, to be general agreement among the statisticians that there are in the world something like 500 million professing Christians *at least*—probably more—and that the numbers have increased enormously during the past century. It must also be admitted that the adherents of Christianity exceed by many millions those of any other religion.

Let us now inquire what part the Church of England has taken in the advance that has been made "in the greatest of all vocations, that of evangelizing the world."

In the recently published Life of Sir Thomas More by R. W. Chambers, there is a graphic statement of the labours of St. Boniface and his companions in the eighth century of our era—"in converting the Teutonic heathen in Friesland and Germany, and later in Norway and Sweden, . . . when all that was noblest in England flung itself abroad in a passion of organized and disciplined effort." "*That* was the real occupation of Germany," remarked a German scholar to Mr. Chambers at the time when the British Army of occupation was at Cologne in 1919.† Has there been anything like this enthusiasm for Foreign Missions on the part of the English in more modern times?

The Dean of Exeter, Dr. S. C. Carpenter, in his admirable work already referred to, has given a striking picture of the awakening of missionary effort in the nineteenth century, after the political and doctrinal upheaval of the age of the Reformation and the lethargy of the eighteenth century. Let us note some of the outstanding signs and results of that awakening.

S.P.G. was founded in 1701, and in the last year of the same

* Quoted by S. C. Carpenter, *ibid.*, p. 446.
† *Thomas More*, by R. W. Chambers, p. 392.

century came C.M.S. in 1799. These two venerable societies have been mainly responsible for the remarkable expansion during the past hundred years of the Anglican Communion throughout the world, though during the earlier period the lion's share in the expansion was taken by the Evangelicals and the Church Missionary Society. Indeed, as the Dean truly remarks, "it was the Evangelicals who taught the Church of England to be missionary."

The three main directions in which the revival of interest in missionary work shewed itself must now be briefly noted.

(i.) *New dioceses for the Colonies and elsewhere.* The establishment and rapid increase of the overseas episcopate is the first and most important of the events which revealed that a new spirit was really at work. At first political difficulties blocked the way. Thus in India in 1774 Warren Hastings made it a fundamental rule of his policy "to discourage missionary effort," and the English Government repeatedly refused the petition of S.P.G. to establish missionary bishoprics in that country, "as if Christianity was some dangerous revolutionary spirit," said Lord John Manners. But at length legal difficulties were removed, and rapid progress began to be made.

In 1784 the first bishop was consecrated for English-speaking races outside the limits of England—namely, Dr. Seabury for the American Church. By 1800 there were 9 Anglican bishoprics outside the British Isles, inclusive of the Church in the United States; in 1900 the number had risen to 178; in 1910 to 209. In 1935 Anglican bishops outside the British Isles, including American diocesans and suffragans, numbered 287.* The expansion may be stated from another point of view: to the first Lambeth Conference in 1867 came 76 bishops; at the last in 1930 the number had risen to 308—most of those who attended coming from dioceses established in Asia, Africa, America, the Antipodes, and "unto the uttermost part of the earth." Excluding America, there are at present 158 Anglican bishops at work overseas.

(ii.) *More workers in the Mission Field.* The number of Anglican missionaries supported by recognized societies is now 3,045, but of these only 1,039 are ordained priests.† In 1913 the Anglican Communion was estimated to have 2,570 Europeans working among non-Christian peoples.‡

(iii.) *Increased financial support.* In 1814 the total income of S.P.G. from subscriptions, donations, and collections was

* Figures for 1935 supplied by S.P.G.
† *World-Wide Witness*, p. 97.
‡ Bishop Montgomery in *Prayer Book Dictionary*, p. 357.

£444. In 1841 it was £41,690. In 1889 it was £86,992.* In 1935 it had reached £192,811.†

"The amount contributed for Foreign Missions by the Anglican Communion in 1800," wrote Bishop Montgomery in 1913, "was probably not more than £7,000; in 1900 it was about £800,000." In 1935 the total sum raised for this purpose, in the churches of the British Isles, was £1,058,726.‡

Anglican Missions compared with those of other Christian bodies. We have now before us sufficient evidence—though necessarily of an external kind—to prove that the revival of interest in Foreign Missions has been real and practical, and that splendid work in this sphere has been carried on, during the past half-century and more, by the Church of England. It will be both interesting and profitable at this point to compare the work of our Church in propagation of the Gospel with that of others. Here we are fortunate in having at hand two witnesses of undeniable authority, who will tell us what they believe to be the true state of affairs.

Bishop Montgomery, the former Secretary of S.P.G., who in his day knew all that was to be known about missionary work, wrote nearly a generation ago as follows:

> "Careful investigation has shewn that the Missions of the whole Anglican Communion are a very small fragment of the missionary work which is being done today in the name of Christ. The following figures are suggestive. Of European workers living and at work among non-Christian peoples, Rome has in its service 34,523; Protestant missionary societies have 16,700; the Anglican Communion has 2,570. The Anglican Communion spends about £800,000 annually on its Missions; the Protestant Missionary societies spend about £4,300,000. . . . Outside the Roman Church upon the whole it is America that is predominantly converting the world to Christianity. The Anglican Communion is accountable for not more than one-seventh of the work done by English-speaking Missions."

World-Wide Witness, in the third Unified Statement of the work of the Church overseas, issued by the Missionary Council of the Church Assembly in 1935, says:

> "The work of our communion is important and essential, but it is in several areas but a small percentage of the work of the whole Christian Church. In South Africa, for example, where it is firmly established, only

* S. C. Carpenter, p. 428. † *World-Wide Witness*, p. 97. ‡ *Ibid.*

about one-fifth of the Christians are members of the Church of the Province. In Canada the Anglican population represents about one-sixth of the total. . . . In the Far East the percentages are smaller still. In Japan it would appear to be but one-thirteenth."*

The verdict of the two authoritative witnesses cited above is on the face of it disappointing in regard to the position occupied by Anglicans in the Mission Field, but, of course, the bare figures tell us little of the real work undertaken and accomplished, and how far it has been successful. But a study of the records of almost any diocese overseas, and of its thousands of workers, laymen and women, as well as bishops and priests, would reveal a story of which no Church need be ashamed. Indeed, the very names—Zanzibar, Melanesia, Uganda, and a score of others—are eloquent for those who know anything of the inner history of Anglican Missions. Truly, they tell of achievements carried through by a devotion and heroism and dogged perseverance beyond all praise—achievements which will bear comparison with anything recorded of any age and in any country in the long life of the Catholic Church. But when all is said, as both our witnesses—one writing a quarter of a century ago, the other only last year—agree, the missionary work of our Church outside these shores is only a small part of that carried on by other Churches.

Why is it so? The Church is awake. And today it is much more generally, if not yet universally, recognized, what Archbishop Davidson said in 1924, that "the support of missionary work is the greatest of all Christian obligations." Enthusiasm for the cause of Foreign Missions has steadily grown. Many sermons are preached every year, and collections are annually taken for S.P.G. or some other Society. Great missionary meetings are constantly held, both in London and the Provinces, and they are often well attended and enthusiastically supported. And, further, the old arguments against sending missionaries to the heathen, which used to be so often heard, have been almost killed by the devoted labours of men and women at the front, and their success in winning to Christ people of all classes and every colour, and also by the testimony given as to the value of their work by Colonial Governors and others who are on the spot and in the best position to observe and appreciate their work.

And yet, despite all the activity and the real progress of recent years, the wheels of the missionary chariot seem for the most part to drag heavily. The progress is much slower than

* *World-Wide Witness*, p. 110.

it might be and ought to be; and it still continues sadly true that "there remaineth yet very much land to be possessed."

Why is it, I ask, that progress is not more rapid? Can it be, as I suggested at the beginning, that the Church in this country, whilst alive on the whole to the importance of overseas evangelization and the duty of supporting those who "go" abroad and labour "to make disciples of all the nations," is still too much, or too exclusively, absorbed in trying to meet and provide for the religious needs of the homeland? Certainly a study of missionary literature *does* suggest something of the sort. If, for instance, we examine the reports issued annually by the bishops abroad, what do we find? We find them lamenting on almost every page that their work is seriously hampered by a grave shortage of clergy and other helpers; and again and again it is stated that even if men and women were forthcoming, there would be no money available to pay even the mere pittance which most missionaries receive as salary.

As to shortage of workers, look at India as an example, or case in point. In 1934 it is authoritatively stated that there were at work among that huge population of 315 million souls 236 Anglican clergy, excluding chaplains and non-Europeans*—that is, only one clergyman to each million or more of the population. How does this compare with the state of things at home? Take, for example, this diocese of Winchester—and I do not suppose it differs substantially from other dioceses—with a population apparently of rather more than half a million, there seem to be nearly 600 clergy, licensed or with "leave to officiate."† To put it another way. If there was only one clergyman at work in this diocese, Hampshire people would be very much better off than the whole of India.

Then as to finance. According to a recent writer in a Church newspaper,‡ the total voluntary offerings receive today for the work of the Church, both at home and overseas, amounts to 7½ million pounds, of which one million only is for overseas. In the *Churchman's Handbook* (1936) there is a fuller and more exact statement on the subject, which yields the following: The voluntary offerings of the Church of England, raised in 1934 by church collections or parochial organizations, were (1) for parochial purposes, £5,118,227; and (2) for extra-parochial purposes, £1,115,239, of which £451,625 were for

* *World-Wide Witness*, p. 128. There were said to be 7,584 missionaries working in India in 1933, including all denominations, from Great Britain, the British Dominions, Europe, and Indians. (Figures supplied by the National Christian Council of India.)

† *Winchester Diocesan Year Book* (1923-33).

‡ *The Record*.

overseas missions. During the ten years from 1925 the average amount for overseas work was a little over £500,000 per annum.*

The two statements of income differ considerably, and are no doubt based on different assessments, but both agree that the money allotted for Overseas Missions is comparatively but a small portion of the total offerings of Churchmen for the whole work of the Church of England.

If these figures are even approximately correct, can we wonder if progress in the Mission Field is slow? And must we not ask ourselves if the Church overseas is getting a fair deal?

Some years ago, after an exhaustive survey of the Mission Field, a series of volumes was issued by the Church Assembly under the general title of *The World Call to the Church*. If we believe that the Church of England is really called by God to world-evangelization, will not the home Church have to shew its faith by its works, and especially (if I may venture to put it so) by much greater readiness for sacrifice? Shall we be content, for example, to keep so many priests at home, ministering to tiny congregations, and providing services and sacraments for which there is little demand? And shall we be satisfied much longer not to be sharing with our brethren abroad the large sums raised annually by diocesan quotas? And must all the big schemes for building new churches and schools and halls look no further than our own shores? For my own part, I am convinced that in the future, if we are going to tackle the missionary problem in the spirit of Christ, and if we are going to justify our expressed belief that we as a Church are called to world-wide evangelization, we in this country shall have to make up our minds to do without much that we have valued and been accustomed to in the past, and greatly restrict our expenditure on such luxuries as elaborate organs, rich vestments, and stained glass windows; and in districts where new churches are required we shall often have to be satisfied, for a time at least, with a plain mission-hall type of building, and not kick even at a corrugated iron roof, and all this for the sake of those who have nothing perhaps but a mud hut for a church, and that mud hut far removed probably from the homes of many who have been enrolled as Christians, and are not less eager than ourselves to worship the Lord. "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ."

Have we now at last arrived at the root cause of any shortcomings there may have been in our missionary efforts, or of any failure to achieve all that the cause deserves and what

* *Churchman's Handbook*, p. 141. The latest returns from the Missionary Societies show that most, if not all of them, have to record that there has been a serious decline in subscriptions, instead of the increase so greatly needed!

our Divine Lord expects of His Church? Not quite, I believe. Can we get further light on the point from the Scriptures?

In the second Psalm we have one of many passages of the Old Testament in which the sacred writers foresaw the final triumph of the Gospel, but here we have not only a prophecy, but also a hint of the means by which the goal may be reached. In this Psalm God is represented as speaking, on some day in the eternal past, to His only-begotten Son thus: "Thou art My Son; this day have I begotten Thee. Ask of Me, and I will give Thee the nations for Thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for Thy possession." In the diary of the Rev. J. P. Struthers* there is a very homely paraphrase of this transaction in the heavenly sphere, which may nevertheless give us a glimpse of the deep underlying truth. "God's words to Christ," it is suggested, "were just as if a mother said, 'What would you like for your birthday? I would like to give you this' (the nations for Thine inheritance)." But a condition was attached, "Ask of Me." Well, we know that Christ did ask, and still asks, for He ever liveth to make intercession for us; and in answer to His intercession mankind has indeed become His inheritance (cp. Heb. x. 13, ii. 7, 8; Eph. i. 21, 22). We are under His rule now, whoever we are or wherever we live; but alas! so many know not the King who is over them. How are they to be brought to the knowledge of their true King? How drawn openly into His Kingdom? The method, the sovereign means, are surely not in doubt. They are the same—by prayer. *Ask of Me.* It is noteworthy that besides preaching the Gospel to all the nations, baptizing and teaching, the only direct command of our Lord about missionary work is that we should pray for it. "The harvest truly is great, but the labourers are few: pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that He would send forth labourers into His harvest"; and "When *ye pray*, say, Thy Kingdom come."†

And is not this—regular, sustained prayer for God's blessing—what as a Church we have most neglected? And, further, is not this the fundamental reason why our missionary work has lacked something which is essential—something of unction, something which kindles enthusiasm and calls forth sacrifice and devotion?

Lack of Prayer. In the Book of Common Prayer there was for 300 years no definite separate prayer at all for Missions, and until the Revised Prayer Book was issued in 1928 this grave defect in our liturgy was not made good. Of course, prayers for missionary work have been regularly offered for many years

* Quoted by James Hastings, D.D., in the *Speakers' Bible*, on Psalm ii. 8.
† Luke x. 2, xi. 2.

by countless individuals, and by many groups and guilds who have met together to pray for the coming of God's Kingdom. In 1872 the Day of Intercession was first held. "The answer of S.P.G. to the murder of Bishop Patteson was to request the Archbishop of Canterbury to approve the appointment of a Day of Intercession for Missions at St. Andrewstide." One of the first fruits of that first Day of Intercession—now officially established in the Church of England—was the final closing of the slave-market in Zanzibar, and in due course the building of the Cathedral of Christ Church, Zanzibar, on the very spot where human beings were once sold into slavery.*

The founding of the Day of Intercession was a great step forward, and full of hope for the future, but it can hardly be said that the duty of helping the missionaries at the front in this, the most effectual way of all, has as yet penetrated far into the consciences of ordinary church-going folk, and until the whole Church will take this call to intercession more seriously we must not look for any very striking progress in the Mission Field.

This paper may fitly close with three anecdotes of prayer, which are well-known but cannot be too often recalled.

(i.) In A.D. 44 Herod Agrippa I. began "to vex certain of the Church." James, the Apostle, had been beheaded. Peter was in prison and threatened with death. No Christian's life seemed safe. The cause of Christ looked desperate indeed. Then it was that "prayer was made without ceasing of the Church unto God." And in a few days everything is changed. Peter is out of prison. The persecutor is dead, *and "the word of God grew and multiplied."* (Indirectly, then, the prayers of the "many gathered together" helped the Church to "grow and multiply": they were missionary prayers.)

(ii.) In 1761 a shoemaker named William Carey attended a meeting of the Baptist Missionary Association, to which he belonged, the purpose of it being to bring the Gospel to people in Bengal. "There is a gold mine in India," it was said, "but it seems almost as deep as the centre of the earth. Who will explore it?" Carey replied, "I will venture to go down, but remember that you must hold the ropes"—meaning that they must support him by their prayers.

(iii.) In 1897 at a Church Missionary Society meeting an old man, over seventy-five years of age, gave this testimony: "I have never failed to pray for this work, as my mother taught me before I was twelve years old." The speaker was Frederick Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury.

To sum up. The Church needs for her Missions much more money, many more labourers to go forth into the harvest of

* S. C. Carpenter, *ibid.*, pp. 439, 447.

the world, and continual sacrifice on the part of all her members, if the work overseas is to prosper and grow as it should.

But, above all, she needs much more regular prayer; she needs men and women who, if they do not go abroad themselves, will at least "hold the ropes" for those who do go—sustain and support them by earnest intercession. "Ask of Me, and I will give Thee the nations for Thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for Thy possession."

F. DOUGLAS ROBINSON.

THE HISTORICAL ELEMENT IN CHRISTIANITY

DURING the last hundred years or so the historical approach to the Gospels has been very carefully examined. And the difficulties in connection with it have become greater and greater. The problem of Christianity has become for many an historical problem more than anything else.

For some it has never been anything else. But there are others who have reached this position from the philosophical side. They have come to see that, no matter how reasonable the Christian doctrine of the Trinity may be, it fails to satisfy in the long run without some kind of certainty with respect to Christ. And that seems to be a purely historical question. The foundation of Christian philosophy seems to be something historical. If the foundation is doubtful, then the whole superstructure is uncertain; and it is being recognized more and more that true faith under those conditions is impossible. For faith cannot rest upon any kind of probability. If a pack of cards is cut, the probability that the ace of hearts will not be turned up is considerable, but it cannot be said that one has faith that this card will not be turned up. Real faith must contain a core of certainty. It is certainty plus opposition, rather than a leap in the dark upon a probability. It is something upon which one can surrender one's whole self; and that is impossible with what is merely probable.

This element of certainty about God is precisely what man needed when Christianity first arose, and which Judaism, for example, could not give to the Gentiles. This is what Christianity asserts that Jesus Christ came to give. This need for a lasting certainty, then, is a need for Jesus Christ, who is, as it were, God accessible to us. But Jesus Christ is more than

that: He is also the revelation of God's whole self. Now God can only reveal Himself fully and completely by living out a life on earth and at some particular time. That is the only way in which man can apprehend God's whole self. And this means that man's need can only be satisfied in history.

It is precisely in its historical elements, however, that Christianity seems to suffer shipwreck. For it is found that history, as such, provides no certainty in connection with any event or person. The doubts with which one is usually concerned, in connection with Christianity, are doubts about certain details of the Gospel stories; but not even the most probable thing in the Gospels is entirely free from doubt. There is always a certain possibility, as far as history is concerned, that the Gospels are founded entirely upon a myth. No doubt the Gospels are based upon reality somehow; but the certainty of that reality is not a certainty that Jesus Christ really did live on earth and really did suffer under Pontius Pilate and really did rise again from the dead after three days. There is nothing in history which can prove this. It can only give a belief in its probability. And even that belief seems to be unjustifiable when the small number of witnesses whose testimony is available is compared with the very much greater number of those who are not accessible.

It has been suggested that the element of certainty in connection with the historical side of Christianity is provided by the supreme values revealed in the Gospels. But value is not reality. One does not surrender oneself to values, but to a reality. Some would interpret their faith as belief in a God who possesses the values displayed in the Gospels. But there is no certainty about this. The supremacy of the value of the Gospel narratives over that of King Lear does not give us any certainty whatever with respect to Christ. The historical element in Christianity is clearly abandoned by such an attitude as this.

The increased emphasis placed on the historical element in Christianity nowadays represents a real necessity in the religious life of man. It is an expression of his need for that foundation of certainty with respect to God which is essential to true faith. But underlying it, very often, is a certain assumption, or, rather, two assumptions. These are that there is a real and completely independent time-order to which supposed events do or do not belong; and that the whole object of man's search is to grasp this time-order itself. One historian may give a very different description of an event from that given by another; but if that event really occurred, then it is believed that there is a core of reality, independent of all man's interpretation, which belongs to this absolute time-order.

There is a sound instinct at work in this belief. It was the same instinct which prevented Kant from abandoning his belief in the thing-in-itself. But unfortunately, like Kant's thing-in-itself, this real time-order, because it is so completely other, so independent of our interpretation, is completely unknowable. Behind the dissatisfaction with the historical uncertainty of the Gospels, then, there lies a feeling that this independent reality ought, somehow, to be revealed to us and made ours. But this is impossible, both because it is so independent, and also because, if it is a time-order, to one part of which we are presumably attached, every other part must be inaccessible to us.

The instinct is a sound one. But if that reality behind history is of this kind, then true Christian faith becomes impossible. However, the truth surely is that it errs in conceiving of that underlying reality as a mere absolute time-order—a mere line. What this idea indicates is simply the form in which history is expressed. The truth surely is that that reality is living and personal—God, in fact. For, as has been seen, the real object of man's search is, not the verification of an assertion about the past, but God Himself in Jesus Christ. It is that which is at the root of the concentration upon the historical aspect of the Gospels.

That the idea of reality as a time-line is a mistake becomes clearer when we realize all the implications of it. It is an assumption that certainty of God is to be achieved by acquiring certainty about the past as such; and that implies that the time-order is the final test of God, and therefore of all things. It implies that everything is historical—that history embraces every aspect of reality. It implies not only that there is an historical element in Christianity, but that the whole reality of Christianity is history. But it is more true to say that Christianity is a life which we live, than that it is the truth about the past. In fact Christianity is more even than that: it is Jesus Christ Himself.

The feeling that the reality which is sought in order to possess that certainty necessary to faith has an historical aspect is right. It is right to say that God's perfect revelation of Himself must be historical. But that reality is Jesus Christ Himself, not an independent time-order. The certainty must be a certainty of Him. There can be no certainty of a life lived in the past. To place the historical aspect before everything else is to lose all sense of perspective.

Christianity requires a complete surrender, not the holding of an hypothesis. But the idea that Christianity rests entirely upon certain past events, as such, cannot possibly lead to

anything more than an hypothesis. Christian faith is a surrender of ourselves to God in Jesus Christ. We cannot surrender ourselves to history. But to realize that is to realize how we can and do achieve certainty.

One of the first things upon which Christianity insists is that our Lord Jesus Christ is to be found in His Church. There, and nowhere else, can we surrender ourselves, body and soul, to Him. There, and nowhere else, do we achieve that utter certainty of Him which is essential to true faith; because there, and there only, are we made one with Him. That certainty is the certainty of immediacy. It is like one's certainty of oneself. The Church is the body of Christ.

It is the Church, then, which comes first in one's approach to Christianity, not history. But, nevertheless, it is still true to say that the certainty of our Lord is to be found in history. For the Church carries history with it as an essential part of it. It is impossible to rest content, within the Church, with the certainty which the Church gives. Faith is not just this certainty. It is the living of a life; and that life has its intellectual side. Christ is more than just the certainty of God; He is the revelation of God. It is when it is asked what is to be discerned in Him, what can be known about this Lord who is found and possessed in the Church, that the historical element is encountered. That knowledge, that vision, is to be sought in the Gospels. It is in that search, based upon the certainty of our Lord which the Church gives, that faith consists. There is tension in that faith. The life of Christ's servant is a warfare. But that tension and that warfare are caused by the opposition which the fundamental certainty of our Lord meets; not by the fact that it is not certainty at all, but only probability.

The Gospels are part of the Church. They may be regarded as the expression of the Church's vision of Christ—the Bride's vision of the Bridegroom. Or, since the Church is also the Body of Christ, the Gospels may be regarded as Christ's knowledge of Himself, expressed in ways comprehensible to us.

It is in those ways comprehensible to us that the difficulties arise. Expression is bound to introduce uncertainty, because it never coincides with the thing expressed. The outward and visible Church, for example, is an expression of Christ's Mystical Body, and as such it is imperfect—as is only too obvious. There is, in fact, imperfection both in the Church's expression and in our apprehension, or comprehension, of that expression. Further, that which is expressed is God's very self in Jesus Christ; and, as has been seen, our knowledge about Him and our vision of Him can only arise from a life lived in time. All this imperfection of expression, then, is the same thing

as the inevitable uncertainty of the Gospels as historical documents. It all forms the intellectual side of the venture beyond the fundamental certainty which, together with that certainty, constitutes faith.

Everything we can say about our Lord is infected with this uncertainty. We are certain of Him; but that certainty is inexpressible as such. All that we know about Him or behold in Him is uncertain, because the vision is the Church's, in the first instance, rather than that of each individual member. Consequently we have to cling to the certainty of our Lord which the Church gives. We make the Church's Vision our own in our membership of the Church. But that is no mere formality; it is something achieved only by an unceasing struggle. We are made one with Christ in His Church. But that union is no mere identity; it is something which has to be lived, and which is maintained only by constant striving. The tension of our faith is the tension of our loyalty to the Church; it is the tension of our daily dying with Christ. It is in this that the opposition to our fundamental certainty of Jesus Christ is found, and that the warfare is waged which makes faith the heroic thing that it is.

The mistake made by those for whom everything rests upon the historical problem is that our Lord is divided into two—Jesus the man, and Christ the Son of God. Even if the truth of the historical statements in the Gospels were overwhelmingly probable, the historian would be no nearer to the revelation of God in Christ, or to Christ's redemption of man.

The great feature of this attitude is its individualism. It replaces the Church as the final guarantor by an absolutely real history; that is to say, it retains an illusory independence by substituting an abstraction in the place of a reality. Our Lord is judged at the bar of history, instead of being surrendered to in His Church. And the Church becomes Church-history with a doubtful parentage.

But to surrender oneself to Christ in His Church is not in any way to surrender freedom. The Gospels may still be judged historically; and they and the creeds may still be seen to be imperfectly expressed. It is Jesus Christ, a living person, in whom we believe; not a collection of historical statements. The Church, as it were, guarantees the Gospels; but what that means historically is problematic. We cannot be perfectly certain of anything we say about God; but nevertheless it is all transformed when it rests upon a certainty of God in Jesus Christ. Instead of being a mere intellectual task, history becomes a part of the vision of God. By itself it can prove nothing: but when its problems belong to a life which possesses the

Church's certainty of Christ, then the living of that life is that solving of those problems.

There is no conflict between history and the Church. A more or less historical statement would be that a man named Jesus was crucified under Pontius Pilate. But the Church makes no such assertion. Whatever the Church does say about our Lord is about Jesus Christ who is God revealed. The full significance of this is attainable only within the Church. The conflict is not a conflict between history and the Church, but a conflict within the Church which is a part of the Church's life. The Church is a bigger thing than is sometimes imagined.

There is uncertainty about the Virgin Birth, and about the miracles, and about the Resurrection, and in fact about everything in the Gospels; and it can confidently be asserted that there always will be this uncertainty about the Gospels as historical documents. But all this uncertainty is internal to the Church. It is a part of the life of faith, not something opposed to it. It does not destroy faith; it is that which fashions the unassailable certainty which the Church gives into a real and strenuous faith.

As a matter of fact, of course, history is continually being transcended. The historical side of a man is only one aspect of him, just as the biological side is another aspect of him. Man is more than a biological specimen or a series of past events. There may be every conceivable doubt about the historical manifestation of Platonism, but there is something in Platonism, behind the historical manifestations, which we can possess for ourselves with complete certainty. The vision of eternity which Platonism gives is not infected with this historical doubt. But this gives us a very inadequate idea of the relation between history and the Church. The Church possesses a life which is the reality behind all history.

It will perhaps be suggested that what is being advocated here is a new form of Eutychianism. In Eutychianism the human nature of Christ was absorbed in His Divinity; and here His human nature seems to be regarded as no more than hypothetical. But that suggestion would rest upon a misunderstanding of what constitutes manhood. Manhood is certainly not a collection of dates and facts, no matter how independent their reality may be imagined to be. And the Church did not condemn Eutyches because it believed in the historical probability of the events narrated in the Gospels. It condemned Him because it was aware of Christ the Man living in its midst. The historical events, of which it was not sure, were only the expression of the manhood, of which it was far more sure because of its perfect certainty of Him. The manhood

of a person is not what we remember of his past, but rather something real in his relationship to us, which may, however, only be further expressible in terms of those memories. And so it is with Christ. There is some slight element of imperfection in every statement made about Him. But that He is Man as well as God is one of the things which we can say of Him, and which the Church does say of Him, with the greatest confidence. The Church would perhaps describe the signs of the human nature which it beholds in Him as the print of the nails on His hands and His feet, and the light on His face of His glorious resurrection. But, whatever it is, His manhood is not something over and done with—a life lived in the past. It is something eternal, which is expressed in the Gospels.

What then is the historical element in Christianity? It is not merely a life on earth which is one episode in God's life and which, compared with God's endless life in Heaven, is as nothing. And yet this is what the strictly historical attitude must teach, if it goes so far as to allow the reality of the Incarnation to be assumed. Does not the Church give the true answer? The Church says that we find and unite ourselves with God in Jesus Christ, and that we find Jesus Christ, so as to know Him, in the Gospels which are a part of the Church. The historical element, then, is not a mere infinitesimal span in the time-order. It is the form—the only possible form—of the Church's vision of Christ. The historical element is more than knowledge about God. It is that through which and by means of which we behold Him.

Christianity is through and through historical, because God to us is through and through historical. There is no part of Him which is inaccessible to us. He has given His all to us—of that we are certain; our certainty of that is our certainty of Him. And that self-oblation, historically, culminates in the death of our Lord upon the Cross.

It is not history, then, but the Church, which comes first in the approach to Christianity. History alone can give nothing more than a possibility. If the historical question is regarded as most fundamental to Christianity, then Christianity can nevèr be more than a problem. But for true faith an element of certainty is essential; and this can only be possessed in the Church. However, far from abandoning the historical side to Christianity, the Church asserts its absolute necessity. For faith can never be a mere resting upon the certainty which the Church gives. That certainty is the immediate certainty of union with Christ; and that can only be an element in a life of strenuous endeavour. Membership of the Church is something which has to be lived. It involves an endless struggle with the

historical problems of the Gospels. In fact, since it is possible to discern Christ, not only in the Gospels, but throughout the whole of history, the historical element in Christianity is nothing less than all history and all its problems. However, the tension of faith which this produces is not a doubt which threatens the Church, and the certainty which the Church gives to us. It is the internal life of the Church—not death.

The Gospels and the Creeds are for us a venture always. But the struggle with historical questions is not all hazard, if it is a part of the life of the Church since we possess Him for whom we make the hazard. The position is not that the Gospels pretend to prove our Lord's reality, but that He, in His Church, is the reality of the Gospels. When we stand and recite the Creed, we are not saying that we believe that certain historical statements are true—that a man named Jesus was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and so on. We are saying that we believe in Jesus Christ the Son of God, Whom we find and are one with in His Church, and in Whom we behold what is only imperfectly expressed in the Gospels and Creeds. We are simply confessing Jesus Christ as Lord.

A. E. SHORT.

MISCELLANEA

"THE LOGIC OF BIRTH-CONTROL": A FURTHER NOTE

I THINK Mr. Sampson has missed the first point of my criticism, a point which can be illustrated conveniently from his reply. In his original article Mr. Sampson wrote, very truly, "Once you isolate the sexual act from the purposes for which God intended it, and justify it as an end in itself, the New Morality comes into its own"—and proceeded to argue that this is what the Lambeth Conference has done. But may not the same charge be brought against Mr. Sampson when he writes that sexual intercourse during pregnancy, or when the wife is past child-bearing, is not morally objectionable? To say that in these cases there is no violation of Divine Law, while it raises by implication the usual quite strong argument against birth control, does not touch the issue between his own apparently conflicting statements. There is, of course, a perfectly good answer, but it answers for Lambeth as well as for Mr. Sampson. It is that in these cases the sexual act is not justified as an end in itself, but as ministering to the secondary ends sanctified within the marriage relationship, and non-existent outside it. And it is these ends only that are envisaged by the Lambeth Report. Mr. Sampson would repudiate with no less horror than the Bishops the suggestion that he was opening the door to extra-marital or homosexual irregularities, and he would be quite right; there is no logical nexus to justify the charge.

On the second point Mr. Sampson does not really escape the consequences of his own logic by raising the argument that parents must be duly married in order to fulfil the duty of bringing up their own children. For what parish priest does not know of unmarried couples bringing up their families—often very well? But the admission that "other questions" may arise to deflect the course of abstract logic applied to life is not irrelevant to this discussion.

There is one more statement in Mr. Sampson's article which I should like to select, arbitrarily perhaps, but not, I hope, captiously, for criticism:

"From time to time one hears it said that what the Churches need is to be persecuted again; and while this often assumes the nature of a gibe, it is impossible to deny its truth. Persecution may be a terrible purge, but it separates the gold from the dross."

Is not this a romantic illusion, all the more dangerous because it is so widely believed? Like the plausible dictum of Fascism, that only in war does human nature rise to its fullest and most virtuous expression, it needs exposure to light and cold water. Mr. Sampson allows that we may hope and pray for deliverance from persecution; wisdom and charity urge us in the same direction. For it is not the sword of the persecutor that is so keenly discerning, nor are his the fires that purify. So far as we can judge a good deal of dross goes in with the gold, and a good deal of gold goes out with the dross. We do not see as God sees; but then He does not need that sort of candle to see by. The incidence of persecution seems to simplify moral issues; actually it obscures them by

making one simple and perhaps spiritually irrelevant issue dominant and decisive. Physical courage becomes the measure of sanctity; fortitude the all-covering virtue. There is no doubt a school which finds this atmosphere bracing and even congenial; but it is scarcely welcome to the pastor, trying to deal patiently and hopefully with individuals in all stages of discipleship, and not at all willing to see the little ones offended by a brusque "either . . . or . . ." It is no denial of the urgency of the Christian challenge to say that it is not best put by the public executioner, or even always by the prophet. We all need the reviving touch of the prophets, and we are thankful when they come. And the prophets go, and sometimes we are still thankful. For they do not always remember that their simple whites and blacks of right and wrong are seldom reproduced in the infinite variety of "cases"—else would there be no need for doctors of moral theology.

To draw all this to an end: it seems to be a merit of the Lambeth Report that it does at least recognize the existence of a moral problem, as distinct from an obvious temptation to sin, troubling many Christians. Again, it appeals to the conscience to exercise itself intelligently—a very desirable thing, striking at one of the weakest spots in the life of the modern Christian. But it may be that the Report does not give the best possible guidance, and on this point all of us who are faced with pastoral anxieties are grateful for the fullest possible elucidation—and not at all grateful for the mere cry of "Treason!" It has been good, therefore, to study Mr. Sampson's reasoned attack upon the Lambeth Report, even though one respectfully rejects his conclusions.

KENNETH HEALEY.

PROCESSIONAL CONFIRMATION HYMN

BEFORE THE BLESSING

Tune—Frome Selwood. *T. W. Staniforth.*

CHOIR AND CONGREGATION.

SEALED by the Holy Spirit go Christians on your way,
And as ye journey onward, on His sure guidance stay.

Wisdom and understanding He hath bestowed on you,
To keep, illumined by them, your heavenward course in view.

His ghostly strength and counsel to choose and do the right,
He gives you Christian soldiers to shield you day and night;

Helped by them to self-conquest, sure knowledge you will gain;
True godliness of Spirit is not embraced in vain.

And now ye are enmantled in God's most holy fear;
Safely across life's ocean His chartered barques to steer.

Also ye are enfranchised, full citizens of heaven,
To share with us at God's board the voyage food thence given.

ALL (*as confirmed file into their seats*).

Then help us, Holy Spirit, from Father through the Son;
With increase of Thy bounties, till we the goal have won.

Till in the heavenly kingdom, with saints now and of old,
We cast our crowns before Thee, our crowns of burnished gold.

Till with the holy angels, and all the hosts of heaven,
We praise Thee, Lord for ever, for these endowments seven.

Here Father, Son and Spirit, avouched* us evermore,
Avouched* by us with homage, we worship, we adore.

EDWARD PARRY (*æt.* 90).

CORRESPONDENCE

CHRISTIAN PACIFISM

DEAR SIR,

As I happen to be in England, may I comment on some references to things Indian in Mr. Martin Wight's interesting paper on Christian Pacifism in your July number?

First, on p. 20, he says that the imprisonment of criminals in India is unchristian. If he is thinking of ordinary criminals, surely this is a *reductio ad absurdum*, proving that his argument has gone hopelessly wrong somewhere. And if he is referring to the political *détenus* still in internment camps, does he realize that any and all of them can themselves at any time secure their release by promising to abandon the campaign of political murder for connection with which they are interned? Many of your readers would not know this. I am assured that it is the fact by the official responsible for one of the largest of these camps.

Secondly, on p. 15, Mr. Wight condemns the bombing of tribesmen. Does he include the use of rifles and machine-guns, or is there something specially unchristian in bombing by aeroplane? If the latter, does he realize that the chief use of the aeroplane on the frontier is to guard withdrawals of our troops, always a difficult operation, by preventing the concentration of tribesmen? Officers tell me that this is the fact. Again, all operations beyond the frontier are for the protection of the villages within our boundary. Mr. Wight stated in the previous paragraph that "the right to be defended is limited." Does he mean that in protecting its frontier villages the Indian Government must stop short of all action likely to cause the death of a raiding tribesman? Actually the policy of the Government and Indian Army is to try to civilize the tribesmen, the building of roads being a chief means towards this end. Some day this policy will achieve its purpose. In the meanwhile must we really allow ourselves to be overrun whenever the tribesmen are hungry?

Thirdly, in his last paragraph, Mr. Wight alludes to Mr. Gandhi as having rediscovered and applied the true Christian principle. Even if non-resistance under all circumstances were granted to be the true Christian principle (which is the point at issue, and which I still cannot grant), is this really what Mr. Gandhi has preached? What Mr. Gandhi has always seemed to me to be saying is "Follow me in non-violent non-co-operation, and we shall beat Government and have things our own

* Deut. xxvi. 17. See authorized Lessons for Harvest Thanksgiving by Bishop of Lichfield.

way." I have never been able to see what was Christian in this. It is only another way of insisting on what one believes to be one's own rights —in this case self-government. Surely insistence on one's rights is just what Christ would not allow? I know no one more bent on having his own way than Mr. Gandhi. Am I wrong in thinking that this is just where, devoted man though he is, he most clearly misses the real point of Christ's teaching and example?

Pacifism is a most attractive creed, yet plain men cannot help thinking that it contains a fallacy somewhere. I enjoyed tremendously Mr. Wight's remarks about "lawyer's doctrine" on p. 17. That seemed an excellent phrase to describe some of the criticisms of our still imperfect South India Union Scheme. But are not the pacifists themselves guilty of lawyer's doctrine? Are they not reading into the Sixth Commandment, and into sayings of our Lord, deductions that were never intended? The law which contains the Sixth Commandment also orders the death penalty for murderers. Did Christ really mean to abrogate the latter? I have had to prepare for the gallows a condemned criminal, and found, as others have also found, I believe, that that end, gladly accepted as it can be by a penitent murderer, did seem the best solution for the tangled mess the man had made of his and other people's lives. I could not feel that God condemned the Government that refused a reprieve.

Until the last few years I should have said that what the European war revealed was the fatuousness even more than the horribleness of war. But in recent years it has begun to look as if an utterly ruthless conqueror—a thing we and probably most nations are incapable of being—might reap solid advantages for his country and be able to maintain them. What the beaten peoples would then hope would be to share, in time, in the prosperity of their conquerors. Mr. Wight seems to say that God's way would be to anticipate this ultimate conclusion by non-resistance of the invader; and I expect he would claim that this would also prevent the moral and spiritual degeneration to which the ruthless conqueror would otherwise be only too likely to succumb. To the plain man this seems only another name for cowardice; he still cannot believe that Christ taught cowardice or that moral good can come from it; and so he, the plain man, still believes that there must be some limit, not, as Mr. Wight says, to the right of defence, but to the sanctity of human life. That there is such a limit is implied, as Mr. Wight shews, by the teaching of the Church since the time of St. Augustine. In India the Jains have so exaggerated the sanctity of *all* life that they deny to human beings any authority over life even in its lowliest stages, and they take elaborate pains to avoid the deliberate destruction even of insect life. Is the mistake of the pacifists this, that they have exaggerated the sanctity of human life beyond the truth? The most precious human possession is not life but the soul. No human authority may tamper with the latter, but has God really put the former beyond all human authority?

✠ RICHARD DYKE BOMBAY.

DEAR SIR,—

The proximity in your notes on Mr. Wight's article of the words "Barthian" and "magnificent optimism" is an unexpected and rather amusing collocation: I have never heard before of any connection between Barthianism (even used in the vaguest sense, as here) and optimism.

You were, indeed, right to fix on that quality in uncompromising pacifism, but it is a quality rising out of the deepest Christian pessimism. It is, indeed, precisely here that Christian pacifism differs from its pagan ally. Mr. Aldous Huxley hopes frantically, desperately, to be able to do something in time—but if the attempt fails that is the end. The Christian pacifist hopes too, though being a realist he thinks it improbable of success—but failure does not worry him. Were the issue between pessimism and optimism we should certainly take Professor Broad's advice (*Hibbert Journal* for March), and choose the more comfortable and convenient gas of the oven. But as the issue is between compromise and God's command the question of results is irrelevant. The problem, as you say, is not so simple as that: but our duty is, and if we obey that we may leave the rest in better hands than ours. Mr. Wight has said all this much more clearly than I in his last paragraph. And it is that that makes me surprised at your misreading of the attitude he expounds.

I am, etc.,

W. R. JARRETT-KERR.

WESTCOTT HOUSE,
CAMBRIDGE.
July 27, 1936.

PELAGIANISM

SIR,

I am not sensitive to charges of heresy levelled against me in some journals, but when this is done by THEOLOGY I think it is due to me to meet the charge.

In the Editorial of August you find me Pelagian. If Pelagius denied the Fall and the Depravity of Human Nature I am, like many of my fellow-Churchmen, a Pelagian. In that sense we are all Pelagians today, as Professor Burkitt remarked at the last Modern Churchmen's Conference which he attended. But if Pelagius denied the necessity of Divine Grace for human salvation, then I am not a Pelagian but stand with St. Augustine, the Doctor of Grace.

You assert that my position "does not give a good stance for criticism," but why not? Modern criticism forbids us to believe in the historical Fall, as Dr. N. P. Williams admits, but to substitute a premundane Fall for it, as he does, is theological legerdemain and incapable of scientific demonstration. The teaching of Jesus Christ as preserved in the Synoptic Gospels forbids us to believe in the depravity of human nature. But to deny the depravity of human nature is not to deny, or to belittle, human sinfulness, and I do so nowhere in my essay in *The Church in the Twentieth Century*.

You add, "It is startling to see what large areas of Christian doctrine would disappear if all his [Dr. Major's] suggestions were carried out." I only plead that those doctrines—not essentially Christian, but dubious and detrimental—should be eliminated from our Church's Public Worship. They might still be retained for private consumption by individuals who find them edifying, illuminating, inspiring, and credible.

H. D. A. MAJOR.

RIPON HALL,
OXFORD.
August 9, 1936.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

Analecta Bollandiana. Tomus LIII., Fasc. iii. et iv.

The current number of the *Analecta* is, perhaps, to the English reader less interesting than usual. However, it contains an account of the martyrdom of St. Sativola, who under the more familiar appellation of St. Sidwell has given her name to a well-known church in Exeter. This virgin martyr was the innocent victim of her stepmother's cupidity, who ordered her father's reapers to kill her when she took them their dinner in the harvest field. To the horror of the murderers a spring gushed out where the body lay, and the astonished watchmen in the city saw on four successive nights a strange light shine over the spot. On the fourth night they ventured to investigate and had a vision of the body of the martyred maiden carrying her head in her hands. Accordingly devout men buried her on the spot and built a shrine there, which became the scene of many miracles. Her day is August 2, transferred by Bishop Grandison from August 1 so as not to conflict with St. Peter ad Vincula. The story is late and legendary but not without interest.

The number also contains the second instalment of the article on St. Sousanik, the Armenian martyr, and a long criticism of the preaching and evangelizing methods of St. Bernard of Sienna by a contemporary, which is prolix but interesting. C. P. S. C.

In the July issue of the *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* Father Druwe sets forth the first form of St. Anselm's "*Cur Deus Homo*?" There is a critical examination of the views of the Abbé Jean Riviere on this matter. Father Constant begins what is evidently going to prove an able consideration of the doctrinal change effected in the Church of England in the reign of Edward VI. Whatever we may think of his conclusions, they are plainly the fruits of wide reading and wide research. Much of this article is necessarily devoted to an analysis of the views of Cranmer, and the author ranges over the dogma, liturgy, and canon law owned by the martyred Archbishop, and indeed over "toutes les branches de la science ecclésiastique" with which Cranmer was concerned. Father Constant comes to the conclusion that the doctrine of Cranmer is not new, for it is precisely (*exactement*) that doctrine of Bucer, Theodore de Beza, and of Calvin himself. The word *exactement* makes at least one reader pause and reflect. R. H. M.

REVIEWS

THE ENGLISH BISHOPS AND THE REFORMATION, 1530-1560. By C. S. Mortimer and S. C. Barber. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 8s. 6d.

The *imprimatur* given to this little book might lead one to suppose that the question of the divine institution of the episcopate, discussed by the Spanish bishops at the Council of Trent on the one side and the General of the Jesuits on the other, has been decided by the Vicar General and the Censor *deputatus* of the R.C. diocese of Westminster in favour of the Jesuits. An Irish Bishop at Trent argued that only by the doctrine that Episcopal Jurisdiction is derived from the Pope could he resist an heretical bishop "consecratum a catholicis" if such a one should be sent by the Queen to claim his diocese. A reference to Dr. Lawlor's *The Reformation and the Irish Episcopate* will shew that the Bishop's argument in Queen Mary's reign faced a practical and not merely hypothetical difficulty. Our authors lay stress on the words "ex mero motu et certa scientia nostris" in the "Supplentes" clause added to the commission for Parker's consecration. They would do well to consider the words in the commission issued by Queen Mary for the deposition of Archbishop Holgate: "Nos tam auctoritate nostra ordinaria quam absoluta, ex mero motu certaque scientia nostra."

On p. 76 our authors tell us that the Pope "alone can mark out new Sees and new divisions, and fill them up with his own accredited servants." Perhaps he may be held to have done this in many cases by subsequent recognition, but it would be difficult for our authors to write a history of the Church during the first nine centuries on the basis of their post-Trentine dogma. More than a moiety of their book is a shallow attack on English ordinations. In the bibliography at the close they mention Bishop Frere's *The Marian Reaction*, but they ignore altogether the evidence afforded by that book. They might have at least noted that Thirlby in 1551 sent one of his deacons to be ordained priest by Ridley, and as this person had been ordained deacon at Norwich in November, 1550, Thirlby had presumably made use of the Edwardian Ordinal. Thirlby, accused by Pole "ab episcopis hereticis ac alias minus rite quorum cumque ordinum et muneris consecrationis susceptionis," amd formerly occupant of a See brought into short existence by Henry VIII., was no doubt "a wise choice" (p. 40) to be sent on an embassy to Rome together with the son of the man

who destroyed the Abbey Church of Battle, and was in possession of Church lands. We are told that the Bull *Præclara Charissimi* of Paul IV. was rediscovered "in the nick of time," but to prevent what we are not told. "The judgment was in fact conclusive" (p. 41). "Paul IV.," our authors write, "condemned Anglican leaders in terms and declared them null and void." The Bull, however, does not even mention either "Anglican Orders" or the "Edwardian Ordinal." The pertinent direction given to it is that all who have been ordained by any one not a bishop or archbishop "rite et recte ordinato" are to be ordained *de novo* by their respective ordinaries. It is a decision, not about a rite of ordination, but about the person ordaining, and therefore it does not "in terms" set forth as invalid Edwardian orders bestowed by (let us say) Bishop King of Oxford, consecrated in 1527. Ferrar, Bishop of St. David's, was burnt on March 30, 1554: Pole arrived on November 30; the Bull *Præclara Charissimi* was issued on June 20, 1555. Our authors cite the "*unique* case" of Ferrar as illustrating the foresight of the Papal directions and as the *type* of case that Pole had to examine on its merits and rehabilitate if he could." Ferrar's case in point of fact is nothing more than an instance of the inconsistency of the Marian bishops. (See Frere, *op. cit.*, p. 111.) At his consecration Thirlby was present and made his communion. Our authors, who speak of "suffragan bishops" when they mean "bishops suffragan," should have noticed that, although the Act of 1534 was repealed in Mary's reign, the bishops suffragan continued under Pole. The lists of bishops given in this book disguise the fact that for about ten years from 1543 Heath was what some would have designated a "pretended bishop of Worcester," for in 1541 the Pope had appointed Richard Pate to that see. On p. 32 Poynet is stated to have been consecrated to Winchester on June 29, 1550: he was consecrated to Rochester on that date, and subsequently intruded into Gardiner's see. The name of the see is given correctly on p. 85, but there it is said that he was consecrated by Hooper, which is untrue. On p. 55 it is stated that the date and nature of the ceremony of Parker's consecration was not revealed till after the close of Elizabeth's reign, and that leads to the insinuation that the Government in 1559 had discovered that Barlow had never been consecrated. Again (p. 59): "The true facts of Parker's consecration were not given to the world till 1614 by Archbishop Abbot." There is a MS. in the British Museum (clesp. F.1, F.45, 46), written in Queen Elizabeth's reign, in which it is argued that at Archbishop Parker's consecration "there was never a bishop at all," that is to say a legal bishop, for "Barlow, Scory, Coverdale and Bale, albeit in King

Edward's days they were bishops, yet were they deprived in the time of Queen Mary and not restored again," and the two Suffragans had also been deposed by Act of Parliament. And as to the date, what is to be said as to the entry in Machyn's diary and the printing of the *De Antiquitate* in 1572? So what of the silence of fifty years?

Some sixteen years ago a brilliant youth aroused a furious debate in Bengal by an attempt to prove that the story of the Black Hole of Calcutta was an invention of Holwell's. The number of people whom he had to represent as Holwell's accomplices became larger and larger, and when at last the youth had to deny the existence of the Holwell monument, he had to encompass in a purple haze of shameless mendacity so great a crowd of innocent travellers who described the Monument, artists who had depicted it, and map-makers who had marked its place, that one could only wonder that he failed to see that the resorts he was put to served to establish the history he sought to demolish. To call Barlow's consecration doubtful necessitates making a quite impossibly large number of conspirators and branding every inconvenient record as a forgery.

WALTER K. FIRMINGER.

CONNOP THIRLWALL: HISTORIAN AND THEOLOGIAN. By John Connop Thirlwall, Jun. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

It was fully time for a complete biography of Bishop Thirlwall to appear, for he was undoubtedly one of the most imposing and important personalities of the last century. Mr. Connop Thirlwall, of New York (who is the Bishop's great-great-nephew), has carried out his task admirably, and has moreover been able to include in his pages many unpublished letters and comments, chiefly drawn from the Thirlwall and Johnes family papers.

Strangely enough, Connop Thirlwall started as an infant prodigy, his father, the Rev. Thomas Thirlwall, having published a small octavo of verses and essays by his precocious boy at the age of eleven. The book was entitled *Primitiæ*, and contained a rather unattractive portrait of the juvenile author, which has been reproduced in the present volume. Needless to add, this premature literary venture was regarded by the Bishop in his mature years "with intense loathing"—"if I could buy up every copy for the flames" (so he wrote to Miss Johnes), "without risk of a reprint, I should hardly think any price too high."

Educated at the old Charterhouse and Trinity College, Cambridge, where he achieved high distinction in the schools,

the young Thirlwall travelled on the Continent and in Rome formed a life-long friendship with Baron Bunsen. On his return home he became a barrister of Lincoln's Inn, and practised for a short time at the Chancery bar. This legal phase of his life was marked by his publication of a *Critical Essay on the Gospel of St. Luke*, being a translation with notes of Schleiermacher's *Lucas*: an exposition of current German theology which was later destined to prove a serious stumbling-block in his ecclesiastical career. In 1827, at the age of thirty, Thirlwall was ordained and obtained a fellowship in his old college of Trinity, Cambridge. His immense learning was certainly appreciated at Cambridge, but his broad and liberal views, especially on the admission of dissenters to the University, brought him into collision with his academic colleagues, so that in 1834 he was glad to resign his fellowship and to accept from Lord Brougham the lucrative country living of Kirby Underdale, near York. Life in quiet Kirby rectory afforded Thirlwall a good opportunity to finish his *opus magnum*, *The History of Greece*, which is still regarded by competent critics as superior to the *History of Greece* of his intimate friend, George Grote, although Grote's work has eclipsed Thirlwall's in popular esteem.

In 1840, Thirlwall, already regarded as a historian and theologian of European reputation, was nominated by Lord Melbourne to the vacant see of St. David's. It has been asserted that this vast, remote and wholly rural diocese was utterly unsuited to Thirlwall's special and peculiar talents. This is true enough; but in all probability Melbourne, in the spirit of the age, intended St. David's to serve merely as a stepping-stone to Canterbury. Owing, however, to his bold and consistent liberal opinions, and possibly also to Palmerston's private influence, Thirlwall was never translated, but continued bishop of St. David's until his retirement in 1874, a year before his death at Bath.

In any case, the position of the Bishop, domiciled in his distant and largely Welsh-speaking see, yet deeply concerned with high politics in London, was not an easy one. The close friend of Thomas Carlyle (who expressed a sincere if somewhat patronizing admiration for the Bishop), of Julius Hare, Maurice, Kingsley, Dean Stanley and other prominent members of the so-called Broad Church school, Thirlwall often found himself out of touch with or in direct opposition to his colleagues on the episcopal bench, notably on the historic occasion of the debate on the disestablishment of the Irish Church in 1868. But the whole course of his public life and activities has been already described in the many histories and memoirs of the Victorian era.

What is of special interest in this present volume is the light thrown on the personal life and character of the great Bishop, especially in relation to the Welsh see that he ruled for thirty-four years. There is no doubt the Bishop suffered acutely from an extreme self-conscious shyness, which he seemed almost powerless to overcome. The well-known writer, Augustus Hare (nephew of Thirlwall's devoted friend, Archdeacon Julius Hare), declares that he had "the most freezing and repellent manner that I ever saw." Yet, in fact, Thirlwall was fond of children and could be delightful with them, as the writer of this review can testify from early recollections of children's parties at Abergwili Palace. He had a special liking for cats, provided they were loud purrers, and he kept geese as pets in the Palace grounds, calling to them and feeding them with his own hand. Certainly, Thirlwall was to the last more respected than beloved by his clergy; at first, he was even detested cordially, for the Bishop found many scandals both of omission and of commission in this huge neglected see that covered more than five whole counties. But long before the end of his episcopate dislike had given place to an admiration that was tempered by awe. To no small extent this change of feeling in the diocese was due to the softening influence exercised by a young lady, whose intellectual friendship with the Bishop presents a curious but most interesting episode in the life of a great shy scholar. Miss Betha Johnes (afterwards Lady Hills-Johnes) was the daughter of a Carmarthenshire squire, and somehow at the age of nineteen she fell into a correspondence with her bishop that lasted for the remaining thirteen years of his life. After Thirlwall's death in 1875 some of his letters to Miss Johnes were edited by Dean Stanley, and published under the title *Letters to a Friend*, and they form a human document of no small value, for they shew how his deep warmth of heart was by degrees drawn out of a chilly forbidding exterior. Both the Bishop's letters and Miss Johnes's (unpublished) letters to him have been charmingly utilized in this biography.

Excellent as this book is, the author has included some errors in his account of the see of St. David's, which are excusable in an American citizen with only a casual acquaintance with western Wales. To one who knows St. David's well, it is indeed news to learn that the ancient market cross in that tiny city is "a Welsh Protestant Martyrs' Memorial" (p. 119). Nor is Llanover in Carmarthenshire, but in Monmouthshire, so that Lord and Lady Llanover could not be accounted neighbours of the Bishop of Abergwili. Also, it is stated (p. 121) that Thirlwall "attained some mastery of the intricate Welsh tongue, a performance unequalled by any of his predecessors

since the Reformation." This is wholly misleading. To give one outstanding instance, it is enough to recall Bishop Richard Davies (1561-1582), who translated the Book of Common Prayer into Welsh, and was likewise largely responsible for the first Welsh New Testament of 1567. But these are small blemishes in an able and agreeable biographical study.

HERBERT M. VAUGHAN.

NOTICES

SIMPLE ADDRESSES: HOW TO PREPARE AND DELIVER THEM. By Helen M. Cobbold. S.P.C.K. 2s. net.

As Mrs. Cobbold says in her preface, the demand for voluntary speakers at women's meetings is a growing one, and the supply is by no means equal to the demand. Realizing that—for good or ill—the day of "just a nice address" is over, many women who quite genuinely feel that they have it "in them" to speak, hesitate to come forward and offer their services to those societies and fellowships which depend largely on voluntary speakers. Such embryo speakers will find much help and encouragement from this most useful little book, as will also their more experienced sisters. The author deals in turn with the speaker, the audience, and the message, and the advice given is clear and practical throughout. Particularly good is the section on pitfalls; and the speaker's alphabet is well worth study.

Appended is a list of societies useful for speakers.

MARGUERITE HOWSE.

BIBLICAL COSTUME. By Marión Logan Wright. S.P.C.K. In four parts. 1s. each.

There are two main conceptions as to the part played in parish life by the production of Bethlehem tableaux, or Passion Plays.

In one, the carefully chosen few present the sacred drama to the larger number of parishioners, whose only "duties" with regard to it are edified attendances, and generous contributions towards expenses. In the other, the producer aims at enlisting the active participation of as many individuals, and groups of persons, as possible, and makes use of all kinds of talent to secure a wealth of detail and richness of effect impossible where only a few persons are interested. The second conception, which is certainly that of Ober-Ammergau, is gaining ground elsewhere, and whereas for the simpler production it may be sufficient to achieve a good general effect with regard to costumes, properties, scenery, etc., when the responsibilities for these are widely shared it may be well to strive for more correctness of detail.

Miss Logan Wright's four-part work will be invaluable to producers of "parish" tableaux, etc., who have this end in view. Not only does she deal exhaustively with the various national costumes which figure in the sacred story, but she gives instructions for the making of the necessary properties, both in simple and more complicated forms. At the end of each part are several pages of numbered plates illustrating the various items at different stages of their construction.

MARGUERITE HOWSE.

STUDIEN ZUM VIERTEN EVANGELIUM. By E. Hirsch. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr. Price about 7s. 6d.

This brilliant essay dissects the Fourth Gospel as follows: (*a*) the original Gospel; (*b*) the additions of the Church-redactor; (*c*) glosses. Chapter xxi. is clearly an addition, the author of which wrote xix. 35. The only question, therefore, is how much farther the revision went; that it included a rearrangement of material is generally acknowledged. The original Gospel consisted of Synoptic and non-Synoptic material; some of the latter may come from a complete lost Gospel. The origin of the original John-Gospel is to be sought in the split in the Jerusalem Church in 66, when a considerable number fled to Pella. This explains its strong anti-Jewish bias, and its polemic against the family of Jesus which became dominant in the later Palestinian Church. John the Son of Zebedee was stoned in 62; he and James (the brother of the Lord) are the two witnesses of Rev. xi. The martyrdom of John, which has left slight traces in tradition, was forgotten because, owing to the complete break in tradition at Jerusalem, there was no Church to perpetuate his memory.

The coming of Christians from Palestine to the province of Asia is proved by the case of Philip, who went to Hieropolis. Among them was a certain John, a younger contemporary of the Apostles. We see his work clearly in the Apocalypse, which fills into two parts: (*a*) an apocalyptic work; (*b*) the letters to the seven Churches, with parts of chapters i. and xxii. The apocalyptic part was composed in 68-69 at Pella, the other part in Asia Minor during the Domitianic persecution. John the presbyter composed both parts, revising his own earlier work. He also composed the Gospel in its earlier form. The reviser of the Gospel and the author of the First Epistle were one and the same person (though the Epistle has suffered revision). His purpose was to connect the Gospel with an eyewitness. In John xxi. he almost identifies this eye-witness with the son of Zebedee, but just stops short. Perhaps no clear information was obtainable on this point.

The reconstruction does justice to many of the conditions of the problem, and may be used without much modification by those who are unable to accept the theory of the early death of John the son of Zebedee or Hirsch's scepticism regarding the historical value of the Gospel. An example of the latter may be seen in the ingenious suggestion that the stoning of Jesus in x. 31, and the retreat beyond Jordan which followed, are a putting back into the life of Jesus of the actual events of 66 A.D.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

THE GREAT GALILEAN RETURNS. By H. K. Booth. Scribners. 6s.

This American book is so well-written, so admirably intentioned, and moves with such a swing, that one would like to recommend it to be read by all. But it is little more than a brilliant enunciation of half-truths. To give some examples of its facile judgments. Galilee was "lush with green fields"; "everywhere was wealth and progress" (p. 4; on p. 72 we read of "the general poverty in Palestine"); the Galileans were "red blooded"; Jesus "must have seen every race and heard every language of the far-flung Roman Empire"; He was a "cosmopolitan"; the Kingdom of God was "a better social order," which would come "by evolution."

Christianity was the "red menace" of the day. Paul is "the founder of the Christian Church"; in him "the Gospel about Jesus" took the place of "the Gospel of Jesus." "The glorious kingdom of the Great Galilean was obscured amid the mists of dogmatism and the clouds of Other-worldliness." At the Reformation the poor for the first time had the Gospel preached to them; and so on. The whole treatment exemplifies a surprising Protestant conventionalism.

The writer seems to rely too much upon secondary authorities, a practice which is startling when the famous passage of Shakespeare ending ". . . this realm, this England" is given as: "Quoted in Randall, John Herman, and J. H. Randall, Jun., *The Making of the Modern Mind*, p. 177."

W. K. Lowther Clarke.

A Diary of Private Prayer. By John Baillie. Oxford University Press. 3s. 6d.

This manual of daily devotion may be commended confidently to all who are feeling the need for a new sense of reality in their prayers, and especially to students. The Diary provides a page of prayers for each morning and evening in the month, with special prayers for Sunday. Opposite each page on which the prayers are printed is a blank page on which prayers may be written. And (a most important point) the publishers have seen that the paper used is suitable for writing on in ink. The language of the prayers is simple and spontaneous, and this proves to be no small help towards naturalness and genuineness when they are used in private devotion. The prayers given are suggestive, and will not fail to invoke further prayerfulness of a more intimate and individual character. The value of the book is that it gives prayers which have the authentic note of private devotion. There is something so intensely individualistic in this Diary that it will appeal to all who are seeking to deepen their personal religion, but, as already pointed out, those with the experience of a student will perhaps appreciate the Diary most of all, not merely because the prayers are made by a student, but much more because the student who made them is fully alive to the larger world of human life with which the student must always keep in touch, especially in his prayers.

Cyril H. Valentine.

"Ordeals of Souls": A Continuation of his Spiritual Letters on the Practice of Self-abandonment to Divine Providence. By Father J. P. de Caussade, S.J. A new translation by Algar Thorold. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 5s.

This second volume of Père de Caussade's letters is to be followed by a third. In the French edition, the treatise on self-abandonment, which is actually a patchwork of letters made after his death, is followed by other letters arranged to illustrate the various sections of the treatise itself. This volume of the translation contains the two middle sections, and one feels doubtful of the wisdom of isolating these sections in publication. To those who do not know the rest of the work, it must seem

disproportionate and incomplete, while to those who do, the piecemeal production is irritating. Valuable as De Caussade's teaching is, it does at times seem lop-sided because it tends to ignore its own completion. Particularly in this section there is no mention of the fact valuably stated by Dom Chapman: "The contemplative is never resigned to the Will of God; he wills it." The soul must learn resignation, but if it stops there it will never attain to "the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."

The translation is correct but colourless.

V. I. RUFFER.

BISHOP CHALLONER: 1691-1781. By M. Trappes-Lomax. Longmans. 10s. 6d.

The life of Bishop Challoner covers one of the most depressing periods in the history of Roman Catholicism in Great Britain, and this biographical study, which its author modestly describes as "derived from Dr. Edwin Burton's *The Life and Times of Bishop Challoner*, is a real contribution to our understanding both of the man and of his age. With the flight of James II. in 1688, the Roman Catholic community in England entered upon a century "in which there was nothing to which to look forward, except endurance to the end." Sixteen years later, Richard Challoner, the boy who was destined, more than any other, to strengthen them in that endurance, was received into the Church of Rome. A scholar, and then a professor, at Douai, he returned to London as a missionary priest in 1730. In 1741 he was consecrated Bishop, as Coadjutor to Bishop Petre, whom he succeeded as Vicar Apostolic of the London District in 1758. (Largely at his insistence, the internecine feud between regulars and seculars, which dated from the extinction of the hierarchy in 1585, had been finally settled by the Pope in 1753.) He died in 1781, in the year following the Gordon Riots.

> At Bishop Challoner's death, the administration of his vicariate passed to other hands. His work there was done. A critical time was beginning for the Church, and his eyes had already seen signs of coming trouble. It is not likely that even he could have averted the contest between the bishops and the laity that was to come. But he was not called upon to take part in that struggle. His duty had been to lead his people over the dreary desert that lay between the Red Sea of martyrdom and the Promised Land of toleration. It was for Josue to fight the battles that were to win their full inheritance. Like another Moses, he looked on it from afar, and went to his rest, content to have been the guide unto the entering in. In his written word he had left them the Law, and they felt his influence abiding among them in the books he had given them and in the memory of his name.

Challoner, says Mr. Trappes-Lomax, "was that common though always unexpected thing, a saint who was also a practical man." His administrative talents were indeed remarkable. "Throughout his life he shewed an immense capacity for work and an exact judgement of what work should be done." But it is perhaps as the author of *The Garden of the Soul* (1740) and *Meditations* (1754) that he is best remembered. The piety which these inculcated is austere for modern tastes. "The impression given by the exercises in the *Garden of the Soul* is one of excessive length

and aridity—they include, for instance, communion at eight stated times a year, and preparatory meditations suited to the seven preceding days. For good or ill, and certainly for comfort, we have got beyond that stage" (p. 38). By contrast with the more florid and sentimental version of Roman Catholicism which is now current in this country—and the contrast is by no means shirked by this biographer—the piety of the old school of Roman Catholics "shewed itself rather in regularity of sober observance than in a multiplicity of pious practices; but then they were more concerned with devotion than with 'devotions.' The staple of their spiritual life lay in the exercise of the theological virtues, in systematic habits of mortification, and in the vigilant practice of Christian charity, both in word and deed. They may, indeed, seem wooden and dry to our more expansive age, but that is largely because they instinctively shrank from any manifestation of self in religion, and considered self-repression as one of the first principles of the devout life. Yet it is this very characteristic of their virtue that causes it to be regarded now as formidable and austere, if not unsympathetic (p. 66); and so we find even Mr. Trappes-Lomax hurriedly reassuring his readers that the qualities of "tenderness and quick sympathy" were in no way wanting, were in fact pre-eminent, in Challoner's own spiritual life. To an Anglican, the contrast has a grim familiarity: for it is, in all essentials, the contrast between the piety of our great Tractarian forbears and that of a certain type of modern Anglo-Catholic. The latter individual will not altogether like this study of "English Catholicism before the Second Spring." But then it was not written for him.

CHARLES SMYTH.

"LES SŒURS DES PRISONS." Jeanne Ancelet-Hustache. Collection "Les Grands Ordres Monastiques." Bernard Crasset.

The series appeals primarily to those interested in the history and variations of the monastic life, but this volume has much to offer others too, the student of social work past and present, or even the casual reader wanting a well-written book.

The Order was founded in Lyons during the first half of last century, and reached its apotheosis during the Second Empire, when the Sisters worked in practically every large prison in France, among both men and women. They are now only used in the four women's prisons in Paris, but their work is so undeniably excellent that many hope that their sphere of influence may be extended again. The Order is not well known, and suffers at present from a shortage of recruits. It is to be hoped that this description of an exacting, humanly speaking almost thankless, but truly wonderful work may help to increase the number of these devoted women. The mother-house is at Le Dorat, and though their primary significance is their prison-work in Paris, the restriction of that work has turned the Sisters more and more to the kindred necessities of orphanage and rescue work. But many Congregations are already devoting themselves in this way, while no other is doing their most special and invaluable work. They are not prison visitors—they have actual charge of the prisoners, under the governor. The French system of licensed prostitution obliges the *filles publiques* in Paris periodically to spend a night under official detention, for control and medical examination. Almost

the most arduous and thankless task the Sisters have is the shepherding and disciplining of this type of "détenue." During the war, the female spies who were caught also passed through the Sisters' hands. The Sister who had charge of Mata Hari can hardly bear to speak of that episode, and the Governor begged the writer of the book not to question her. One vivid section deals with the Commune, and another is devoted to the "Madeleines," a kind of order of penitents living beside and dependent on the Sisters. They are prisoners who have served their sentence, and have during it experienced a real conversion. Unwilling to return to the turmoil and the temptations of their former life, they remain with the Sisters as penitents. Their spirit is not that of gloomy regret, but of tranquil expiation. They wear a kind of habit, and are occupied in manual work, under a simple rule.

The book is singularly well written, and should appeal even beyond the interest of its subject-matter, on account of its vivid descriptions of people and incidents and odd corners, and the atmosphere of unsuspected significance that it manages to convey. It is truly a romance of heroism, of hope against hope, of unending perseverance—in short, an epic of the grace of God.

V. I. RUFFER.

LE CHANOINE ALBIN VAN HOONACKER. Par J. Coppens. Desclée, de Brouwer et Cie, and Librairie J. Duculot. 50 fr.

The death of Van Hoonacker in November, 1933, deprived the world of Old Testament scholarship of one of its outstanding figures, and there will be a large number of Bible students, of all shades of religious opinion, who will welcome cordially this appreciation of the man and of his work. It presents to us an attractive picture of the man himself, a humble scholar who dared to be independent without becoming aggressive, a painstaking but imaginative worker, an original but sober thinker, an exacting yet inspiring teacher, and a devout Catholic. While he had long been known as a scholar, the years of his exile from Louvain during the Great War gave him a wide circle of friends in this country, in spite of his somewhat retiring nature, and he frequently contributed articles both to the *Expositor* and to the *Expository Times*.

Appropriately enough, the pages of this memorial volume are devoted to the external facts of his life, and the remainder to an account of his contributions to Biblical scholarship. The work was, in truth, the man; he had few other ties or interests, and was able to give himself wholly to the study and elucidation of the problems which the Old Testament presents. His industry was enormous, the list of his published books and articles contains over a hundred items, spread over nearly fifty years, and he printed nothing until his subject had been patiently examined from every point of view. Yet he was no pedant, and all that he did was inspired by sympathetic insight and restrained imagination. While his interests were varied, and included general Semitic philology, philosophy, and theology, his chief work was done in three departments of Biblical study—the Law, the Minor Prophets, and the post-Exilic community.

Professor Coppens has given us an admirable account of Van Hoonacker's work, in each case expounding his position with fairness and clarity. His treatment shews enthusiasm and affection for the

master, and is constantly illuminated by remarks and quotations which help us to realize the man behind the work; it is no mere chronicle or series of reviews that we have before us. There is, it is true, from time to time a suggestion of a feeling which will surprise Protestant readers, for the author evidently takes pride in the fact that the work of a Belgian Catholic should be so fully recognized by scholars of other nations and of a different branch of the Christian Church. This feeling, however, is possibly to be explained by the comparative neglect of Roman Catholic Biblical studies by Protestant scholars, and certainly Van Hoonacker was a man who justified the pride of his friends. We lay the book down with a feeling of genuine admiration both for the teacher who could command, and for the pupil who can give, so warm-hearted an allegiance.

T. H. ROBINSON.

THE REVIVAL OF PASCAL: A STUDY OF HIS RELATION TO MODERN FRENCH THOUGHT. By Dorothy Margaret Eastwood. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 12s. 6d.

This is a most remarkable and brilliant book. It would be idle to pretend that it is easy reading, though its style is both eloquent and individual. Its thought is too compressed, the subjects with which it deals are too profound and subtle to make it attractive to anyone who is not prepared to read deliberately and with concentration. But for those who will do this (and are likely to be interested in the subject) it will more than repay perusal. Professor Rudler in his introductory note claims that "some of the chapters are superb." This is high praise: but it does not seem excessive. The book derives an added poignancy from the fate of its author, a brilliant young woman student who, in spite of being a life-long cripple from arthritis, managed to win high honours at Oxford, and, having written her book as a thesis for the D.Phil. degree, died at the age of thirty, after a series of operations undertaken in the hope of a cure. Here, it is clear, was one well qualified to serve as an interpreter of Pascal by virtue of a deep community of both mind and experience—one in whom an acute and questing intellect was united to deep religious feeling, and at the same time one who was forced into hourly consciousness of *la misère de l'homme*, yet was no less determined to transcend and *use* it.

The purpose of the book is to illustrate and explain the immense advance in Pascal's fame and significance that has taken place in France during the last two generations. His literary reputation and his importance as a great figure in a great age have, of course, always been secure. But in the middle decades of the nineteenth century he was hardly taken seriously either as a philosopher or as an apologist. The breakdown, however, of the triumphant, optimistic materialism of the "Reign of Science" of 1850-90, with its claim to have solved the riddle of the universe for good and all, and to have set the feet of mankind firmly on the path of "progress," brought him into his own. Miss Eastwood shews how the leading ideas of the men who captained the revolt against that arrogant intellectual tyranny and were the pioneers of the modern philosophic and scientific outlook—such men as Poincaré, Bergson and William James—were in essence much the same as those formulated by Pascal two centuries before. Specially interesting—and all the more

because of the lack of any adequate treatment of the subject hitherto in English—is the account given of the two distinguished Catholic thinkers, Maurice Blondel and Père Laberthonnière, who were the authors of the "new apologetic" and were to fall victims to Pius X.'s condemnation of Modernism in 1907. In close connection with the new current of ideas and, like it, in conscious or unconscious harmony with the Pascalian outlook, was the emergence in the youth of France of the "new spirit" which, by its devotion to the active and heroic ideal in place of the dilettantism of the previous generation, was to prepare the nation to meet and overcome the German menace of 1914-18. Later chapters deal with the now acknowledged right of Pascal to the names of mystic and saint, and with his literary pre-eminence, in regard to which the *Pensées* are represented as having an affinity with Dante and Shakespeare in the dramatic and epical quality implicit in them as a portrayal of the heroic soul struggling with the challenge of experience, of the "poetry of conduct." A book of this kind could only be written by one who had read immensely in a range of literature of a very exacting kind. But the author is never overwhelmed by her material: her critical faculty and her power of tracing the interconnection of ideas give freshness and individuality to all that she touches. Not only does she draw the mental portrait of an age, but she communicates to the reader the force and fire of its characteristic ideas and of the great soaring spirit who found at last his fulfilment in these.

C. S. PHILLIPS.

BOOK NOTES

Eden : The Biblical Paradise. By W. H. Lane. Edinburgh: The Riverside Press. 2s. 6d. Colonel Lane (of the Indian Army, retired) discusses the four rivers of Paradise, the geography of which represents the state of the Old World before a great volcanic upheaval, which is depicted in the flaming sword. The names of the rivers are explained by their nearest meanings in modern Turkish. The Tree of Life was a banyan tree. Cain and Abel also are explained from Turkish. After the great catastrophe mankind emigrated to various places, including the earthly Paradise occupied by the present Loch Ness, a locality of great interest in view of the "monster." This is a fair summary of the book, not an attempt to be humorous.

The Faith of the Catholic Church. By A. W. F. Blunt, Bishop of Bradford. Oxford University Press. 4s. A new edition of an admirable little book first published in 1916. The Bishop's treatment of the use of the Athanasian Creed in church is piquant when we remember the outcry against the shelving of the Creed by the 1928 Prayer Book, and the fact that the Bishop is perhaps the most prominent Anglo-Catholic on the Episcopal bench. "The Church is defeating its own object if it insists on retaining a use which certainly increases prejudice and has no obvious justification or propriety.

W. K. L. C.

Printed in Great Britain by Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher